



1907.

# RAJPUTANA AGENCY.

## POLITICAL BRANCH.

### Serial Nos. 1-39.

*Grievances of the Rawat of Salumbar against Mewar.*

*Miscellaneous disputes with the Mewar Darbar (Main file).*

## CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
Serial No. 1. Letter No 465, dated the 23rd December 1907, from the Resident, Mewar, with enclosures. Forwards report in the matter of differences between the Rawat of Salumbar and the Maharana of Udaipur.	1
Serial No. 2. Letter No. 373-C., dated the 9th February 1908, from First Assistant to Agent to the Governor-General, to the Resident, Mewar. Conveying Agent to the Governor-General's views in the matter.	36
Serial No. 3. Letter No. 55, dated the 19th April 1910 from the Rawat of Salumbar, submitting Parts III, IV and V of his representations.	37
Serial No. 4. Endorsement No. 131-C., dated the 21st May 1910, from First Assistant Agent to the Governor-General, to Resident, Mewar. Forwarding Serial No. 3 for opinion.	37
Serial No. 5. Letter No. 58, dated the 10th May 1910, from the Rawat of Salumbar regarding his grievances against the Mewar Darbar.	37
Serial No. 6. Endorsement No. 206-P., dated the 14th June 1910, from First Assistant to Agent to the Governor-General, to Resident, Mewar. Forwards for action Serial No. 5.	38
Serial No. 7. Letter No. 68, dated the 3rd July 1910 from the Rawat of Salumbar. Regarding his grievances against the Mewar Darbar.	39
Serial No. 8. Endorsement No. 2759, dated the 20th July 1910, to the Resident, Mewar. Forwarding Serial No. 7.	39
Serial No. 9. Letter No. 1, dated the 29th July 1910, from the Rawat of Salumbar. Regarding his grievances against the Mewar Darbar.	40
Serial No. 10. Endorsement No. 608, dated the 9th August 1910, to the Resident, Mewar. Forwards for report Serial No. 9.	40
Serial Nos. 11, 12 and 13. Letters, dated the 7th October and 8th November and telegram dated the 8th October 1910, from the Rawat of Salumbar. Regarding his grievances against the Mewar Darbar.	41-43
Serial No. 14. Endorsement No. 11-C., dated 20th October 1910, to the Resident, Mewar. Forwards, for report, Serial No. 13.	43

CONTENTS—*contd.*

PAGE.

Serial No. 15.	Letter No. 12, dated the 6th October 1910, from the Rawat of Salumbar. Regarding his grievances against the Mewar Darbar.	43
Serial Nos. 16, 17, 18 and 19.	Endorsements Nos. 369, 372, 373 and 374, dated the 1st December 1910, from the Resident, Mewar. Forwards his report called for in serial Nos. 6, 8, 10 and 14.	44—48
Serial No. 20.	Extract from letter No. 65-P., dated the 9th May 1911, from Agent to the Governor-General, Rajputana, to the Government of India, Foreign Department. Forwarding Rawat's memorial.	47
Serial No. 21.	Extract from letter No. 1064-I. A., dated the 24th May 1911, from Foreign, to Agent to the Governor-General. Reply to Serial No. 20.	48
Serial No. 22.	Extract from letter No. 102-P., dated the 7th June 1911, from First Assistant to Agent to the Governor-General, to Resident, Mewar. Conveying Government orders in serial No. 21.	48
Serial No. 23.	Agent to the Governor-General's note, dated the 23rd June 1911.	48
Serial No. 24.	Letter No. 44, dated the 12th February 1913, from the Resident, Mewar. Forwards a kharita from the Rawat of Salumbar bringing to notice certain grievances.	48
Serial No. 25.	Memorandum of grievances submitted by the Rawat of Salumbar, dated the 28th March 1913.	49
Serial No. 26.	Letter No. 35, dated the 24th April 1917, from the Rawat of Salumbar. Regarding his grievances.	52
Serial No. 27.	Letter No. 263, dated the 14th May 1917, to the Resident, Mewar. Forwards Serial No. 26.	55
Serial No. 28.	Letter No. 44, dated the 31st May 1917, from the Rawat of Salumbar. Regarding his grievances.	55
Serial No. 29.	Endorsement No. 340, dated the 15th June 1917, to the Resident, Mewar. Forwards for report serial No. 28.	60
Serial Nos. 30 and 31.	Letter No. 54, dated the 30th June 1917, from the Rawat of Salumbar. Regarding his grievances.	60—64
Serial No. 32.	Endorsement No. 401, dated the 18th July 1917, to the Resident, Mewar. Forwards for report serial Nos. 30 and 31.	67
Serial No. 33.	Memorandum, dated 9th August 1917, submitted by the Rawat of Salumbar.	67
Serial No. 34.	Telegram No. 217, dated the 11th August 1917, from the Resident, Mewar. Reply to Serial No. 32.	68
Serial No. 35.	Letter No. 262, dated the 14th September 1917, from the Resident, Mewar. Forwards his report called for in serial No. 27.	68
Serial No. 36.	Letter No. 609, dated the 14th November 1917, to the Resident, Mewar. Conveying Agent to the Governor-General's views on Serial No. 35.	74
Serial No. 37.	Letter No. 83, dated the 15th March 1918, from the Resident, Mewar. Submits his report called for in Serial No. 36.	74
Serial Nos. 38 and 39.	Letters, dated the 19th March 1918 and 30th April 1920, from the Rawat of Salumbar. Regarding his grievances.	75—76

# RAJPUTANA AGENCY.

## POLITICAL BRANCH.

### NOTES.

#### GRIEVANCES OF THE RAWAT OF SALUMBAR AGAINST MEWAR. MISCELLANEOUS DISPUTES WITH THE MEWAR DURBAR (MAIN FILE).

FROM THE RAWAT OF SALUMBAR, PETITION DATED THE 1ST (RECEIVED 5TH) FEBRUARY 1907

*Stating his grievances against the Mewar Durbar.*

2. - The following is a purport of the Rawat's grievances:—

\* \* \* \* \*

VI. That the Bhils of Nitharia, Sarara and Beras who looted Jarole, Khejar and Karavali, three of the Thikana's 1st class villages, were let off unpunished by the Durbar Court and the loss was not fully compensated.

\* \* \* \* \*

VIII. That the Thikana is not now allowed to settle amicably boundary disputes with the adjoining States of Banswara, Dungarpur and Partabgarh.

IX. That the Faujdar and Kamdar of the Thikana were formerly exempt from personal attendance at the Durbar Courts but now it is insisted upon.

\* \* \* \* \*

XI. That the Durbar harass the Thikana by sending Dhons from time to time.

3. The above petition was handed to the Agent to the Governor-General by the Salumbar Kamdar and Vakil on the 5th February 1907.

In this connection kindly see the translation of the Rawat's petition attached to the Resident's letter No. 412, dated the 23rd August 1906.

In our demi-official letter of the 29th November 1906 the Resident was told that Colonel Herbert agreed with him that no action need be taken in the matter of the Rawat's complaints until he had an opportunity of discussing Mewar affairs with the Agent to the Governor-General.

D. M. MODI,—13-2-1907.

4. I understand that Mr. Hill wishes Agent to the Governor-General to defer any action on this case for the present.

C. C. WATSON,—13-2-1907.

AGENT TO THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL.

5. Yes. We had better write demi-officially to Mr. Hill and say that, after discussing this case in connection with Mewar affairs generally with him, I propose to await a further report from him before dealing with Major Pinhey's letter No. 412, dated the 23rd August 1906. I shall hope to receive his report in six months' time.

Put up file again on the 15th August at latest.

E. G. COLVIN,—15-2-1907.

6. FROM THE RESIDENT, MEWAR, NO. 465, DATED THE 23RD DECEMBER 1907.

Serial No. 1

*Regarding the grievances of the Rawat of Salumbar.*

\* \* \* \* \*

7. The Matampursi question is the main one, and once that is decided Mr. Hill thinks that the others will be settled without difficulty.  
Extract of notes taken from Matampursi case.

\* \* \* \* \*

C. C. WATSON,—21-1-1908.

AGENT TO THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL.

8. As regards the other questions involved it does not seem necessary for me to express any opinion at this stage, but I sincerely trust that the main question having been settled, both sides will approach them in a conciliatory spirit and that a mutual arrangement will be arrived at. His Highness the Maharana having succeeded in his contentions on the main issue, will no doubt be disposed to meet Salumbar's reasonable requests in a liberal spirit in minor matters.

\* \* \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

E. C. COLVIN,—6-2-1908.

9. ISSUED NO 373-C, DATED THE 9TH FEBRUARY 1908.

Serial No. 2

10. FROM RAWAT UNAR SINGH OF SALUMBAR, KHAT DATED THE 26TH MAY (RECEIVED 16TH JUNE) 1908.

*Regarding his alleged grievances against the Mewar Durbar.*

\* \* \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

11. The gist of this lengthy petition is that the Rawat feels hurt that notwithstanding his acceptance of the compromise effected by Mr. Hill regarding the Matampursi, the Durbar have made no move to settle the other questions. \* \* This is regrettable.

We may forward the khat with its translation to the Resident with a remark that the Agent to the Governor-General trusts \* \* \* that the rest of the Rawat's grievances will be settled on a fair and liberal basis.

\* \* \* We may acknowledge the Rawat's khat and inform him that it has been forwarded to the Resident for disposal and that all future communications on the subject should be made to him.  
The investigation of the case must occupy time and he cannot expect me to interfere while it is still under consideration.

E. G. COLVIN.

AGENT TO THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL.

H. B. ST. JOHN,—20-6-1908.

E. G. COLVIN,—20-6-1908.

12.

13. Extract from demi-official letter dated the 20th June 1908 from the First Assistant to the Agent to the Governor General, Rajputana, to Captain R. Chenevix Trench, Resident, Mewar.

\* \* \* \* \*

The Hon'ble the Agent to the Governor-General trusts that His Highness the Maharana will send the Maharaj Kunwar to Salumbar as soon as it can be conveniently arranged, and that the rest of the Rawat's grievances will be settled on a fair and liberal basis.

14. DEMI-OFFICIAL FROM CAPT. R. CHENEVIX TRENCH, THE RESIDENT, MEWAR, TO CAPT. H. B. ST. JOHN, I.A., FIRST ASSISTANT TO THE AGENT TO THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL IN RAJPUTANA, DATED THE 6TH JULY 1908.

I heard two days ago from the Maharaj Kumar that His Highness the Maharana had definitely settled that he was to go to Salumbar during the next fortnight \*

Under these circumstances I would respectfully suggest that the wish expressed by Mr. Colvin in paragraph 2 of your letter 328 dated the 28th June should not be conveyed to His Highness more specially since there is every indication that the Rawat's other grievances will be settled in due course, on a fair and liberal basis.

15. Extract from demi-official letter dated the 29th November 1903 from the Hon'ble Lieutenant-Colonel A. F. Pinhey, C.I.E., Agent to the Governor-General; Rajputana, to A. T. Holme, Esq., Resident, Mewar.

\* \* \* \* \*  
I hope that all further trouble with Salumbár will now be avoided.

16. FROM THE RAWAT OF SALUMBAR, LETTER NO. 55 OF THE 19TH APRIL 1910. Serial No. 3

Submits his representations regarding customs and salt compensation, (2) his right to Sosnik villages and the village of Para, (3) certain miscellaneous rights and privileges of the Salumbar Thikana.

17. The representations of the Rawat refer to matters relating to internal administration with which it is perhaps not necessary to interfere, but Agent to the Governor-General may wish to discuss the matter with the Resident when he meets him next.

A. D. S.,—5-5-1910.

\* \* \* \* \*

18. The petitions which we have received from the Rawat should have come through the Resident and they might perhaps be sent to the Resident for submission with his remarks.

R. E. HOLLAND,—13-5-1910.

AGENT TO THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL.

\* \* \* \* \*

19. Send Parts II, III, IV and V as proposed.

\* \* \*

E. G. COLVIN,—15-5-1910.

20. Draft to Resident, Mewar, submitted.

A. D. S.,—17-5-1910.

21. ISSUED NO. 131-C., DATED THE 21ST MAY 1910.

Serial No. 4

22. FROM RAWAT ONAR SINGH OF SALUMBAR, NO. 58, DATED THE 10TH MAY 1910.

Serial No. 5

Complains of the insubordination of his jagirdars.

23. May perhaps be forwarded to the Resident for such action as he may deem proper.

A. D. S.,—10-6-1910.

24. May issue. \*

\* \* \* \* \*

R. E. HOLLAND,—11-6-1910.

AGENT TO THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL.

25. Forward to Resident for such action as he may deem proper, with the request that these complaints also may be dealt with in the reply to this office endorsement No. 131-C., dated the 21st May 1910.

\* \* \* \* \*

E. G. COLVIN,—12-6-1910.

26. ISSUED No. 206, DATED THE 14TH JUNE 1910. Serial No. 6

27. LETTER FROM THE RAWAT OF SALUMBAR, No. 68, DATED THE 3RD JULY 1910. Serial No.

28. *Regarding his grievances against the Mewar Durbar.*  
The report called for from the Resident may be awaited.

A. D. S.,—11-7-1910.

29. The new receipt might also be sent to the Resident.

R. E. HOLLAND,—12-7-1910.

30. E. G. COLVIN,—13-7-1910.

31. Draft submitted.

A. D. S.,—13-7-1910.

32. R. E. HOLLAND,—15-7-1910.

33. ISSUED No. 2759, DATED THE 20TH JULY 1910. Serial No. 8

34. LETTER FROM THE RAWAT OF SALUMBAR, No. 1, DATED THE 29TH JULY 1910. Serial No. 9

*Regarding assault made by Padam Singh, etc., refractory jagirdars of his Thikana.*

35. Send to Resident for report with report on previous petitions.

E. G. COLVIN,—2-8-1910.

36. Draft endorsement submitted for favour of approval.

S. D. J.,—7-8-1910.

37. R. E. HOLLAND,—7-8-1910.

38. ISSUED No. 608-P. O., DATED THE 9TH AUGUST 1910. Serial No.

39. LETTER FROM THE RAWAT OF SALUMBAR, No. 13, DATED THE 7TH OCTOBER 1910. Serial No.

*Gives an account of his grievances against the Mewar Durbar.*

40. May be forwarded to the Resident in continuation of previous correspondence.

A. D. S.,—11-1-10.

41. FROM SALUMBAR MOTAMID, DATED THE 9TH NOVEMBER 1910. Serial No

*Encloses a kharita from the Rawat of Salumbar and asks for an interview.*

42. Please have kharita translated.

43. Translation is attached to the kharita.

A. D. S.,—10-11-1910.

R. E. HOLLAND,—10-11-1910.

44. AGENT TO THE GOVERNOR GENERAL.

45. Will First Assistant please write to Mr. Holme demi-officially and say that I should be glad if he could arrange to let me have his report on the Salumbar representations by the time I come to Udaipur on the 28th instant.

E. G. COLVIN,—13-11-1910.

46. Done.

R. E. HOLLAND,—14-11-1910.

47. TELEGRAM FROM THE RAWAT OF SALUMBAR, DATED THE 8TH OCTOBER 1910. Serial No. 13  
*Regarding his grievances against the Mewar Durbar,*

48. We can only send this to Resident to be dealt with in connection with other petitions.

49. Draft endorsement submitted. E. G. COLVIN,—8-10-1910.

50. A. D. S.,—17-10-1910. R. E. HOLLAND,—17-10-1910.

51. ISSUED No. 11-C., DATED THE 20TH OCTOBER 1910. Serial No. 14

52. FROM THE RESIDENT, MEWAR, No. 369  
372  
373  
374, DATED THE 1ST DECEMBER 1910. Serial Nos. 16,  
17, 18 and  
19.  
*Returns with his report Rawat of Salumbar's representations.*

53. The draft below may issue. E. G. COLVIN,—25-4-1911.

54. ISSUED No. 65-P., DATED THE 9TH MAY 1911. Serial No. 20

55. FROM FOREIGN, No. 1064-I. A., DATED THE 24TH MAY 1911. Serial No. 21  
*Conveys orders on this office letter No. 65-P., dated the 9th May 1911, regarding Salumbar Rawat's grievances against the Mewar Durbar.*

56. Resident might also be told that the question of the action to be taken as regards the four other memorials of the Rawat will be discussed during Agent to the Governor-General's approaching visit to Udaipur. R. E. HOLLAND,—29-5-1911.  
AGENT TO THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL.

57. Draft letter submitted. E. G. COLVIN,—31-5-1911.

58. A. D. S.,—5-6-1911. R. E. HOLLAND,—5-6-1911.

59. ISSUED No. 102-P., DATED THE 7TH JUNE 1911. Serial No. 22

60. I have read carefully the Rawat's representations, Parts II, III, IV and V, and I add a brief note which may be put on the file. Serial No. 23  
Please send copy of that portion of the note which relates to Part II to Resident and ask him to have the note ready for me when I visit Udaipur, if possible. It can probably be prepared from his office records. E. G. COLVIN,—23-6-1911.

61. Case (5) consists of four parts, viz.:—

- (a) claim of Salumbar estate and tenants to receive free irrigation from the Jaisamand;
- (b) encouragement of certain jagirdars of the Thikana by Khalsa officials in their attitude of insubordination towards the Thikana;
- (c) dispute regarding the lands of the village of Devli in Salumbar;
- (d) complaints of disobedience, oppression and non-compliance with orders against the Salumbar officials and Rawat.

For Resident's report on this case, kindly see serial Nos. 16, 17, 18 and 19.

A. D. S.—13-11-1911.

\* \* \* \* \*

**62.** It is perhaps inadvisable to take any action at present. The Maharana is ill, and if he were well it is doubtful if he would do anything towards a settlement of this question, except under the most severe pressure, and even then there would be no real improvement in the situation.

If His Highness did anything notably unjust or tyrannous, we should hear about it at once. It appears best to leave matters to time—the relations between the Maharana and the Salumbar Chief may change for the better with a change of persons, which is likely to be not very far distant. The present Maharana knows that the case is well known to Agent to the Governor-General, and Government of India and will no doubt go gently.

H. WILKINSON,—7-12-1912.

AGENT TO THE GOVERNOR GENERAL.

**63.** No action is advisable at present with the Maharana in his present weak condition.

But I think an effort should again be made to induce better relations when next I visit Udaipur. And the file may be put before that. Possibly, Lord Hardinge's recent speech may have some effect on the Maharana. I learned from Colonel Kaye, while I was at Udaipur, that a number of "dhons" imposed on the Salumbar estate had recently been withdrawn, and possibly a better feeling may supervene.

E. G. COLVIN,—8-12-1912.

**64.**

FROM THE RAWAT OF SALUMBAR.

Serial No

*Memorandum of his grievances against the Mewar Durbar.*

**65.** Received from Rao of Salumbar direct. Put up the file at Abu.

E. G. COLVIN,—28-3-1913.

\* \* \* \* \*

**66.** Grievances 10 to 13 appear to be fresh complaints.

Grievances 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 26, 27 to 34 appear to be fresh complaints.

A. D. S.—28-4-1913.

**67.** Please see the preceding note. There are a few fresh complaints, *viz.*, Nos. 10 to 13, 19 to 22, 24, 26 and 27 to 34.

It seems unlikely, in view of the present relations between the Maharana and the Rawat, that these will be settled between the parties.

If a reconciliation between them could be effected, then the Maharana might be persuaded. Since writing I have seen the confidential to appoint a commission to go into the complaints File No. 45 in which the question of a commission and make recommendations for his approval. was adumbrated.

But as it is such a solution is not likely to occur.

**68.** The memorandum may be filed, opportunity being taken to speak to the Maharana again when you next visit Udaipnr.

A. D. BANNERMAN,—5-5-1913.

AGENT TO THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL.

**69.** We might send it in original (to be returned) to Resident, Mewar, for information, pointing out the paragraphs which appear to contain complaints that are new to me.

And we may ask him if he has been able to make any progress in the direction indicated Page 51, File No. 45. in the last paragraph of my demi-official of 7th January last.

E. G. COLVIN,—6-5-1913.

**70.** Demi-official for issue.

A. D. BANNERMAN—6-5-1913.

71. DEMI-OFFICIAL FROM LIEUTENANT COLONEL A. D. BANNERMAN, C.V.O., C.I.E., I.A., FIRST ASSISTANT TO THE AGENT TO THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL, RAJPUTANA, TO LIEUTENANT-COLONEL J. L. KAYE, I. A. RESIDENT, MEWAR, DATED THE 7TH May 1913.

I am desired to forward, for your information a memorandum\* of grievances submitted by

\*To be returned. the Rawat of Salumbar. The following paragraphs of the memorandum refer to complaints which

do not appear to have been put forward before :—

Paragraphs 10 to 13, 19 to 22, 24, 26, 27 to 34.

Sir Elliot Colvin will be glad to know if you have been able to make any progress in the direction indicated in the last paragraph of his demi-official letter (confidential) of the 7th

T.45—Confidential. January 1913.

72. DEMI-OFFICIAL LETTER FROM LIEUTENANT-COLONEL J. L. KAYE, I.A., RESIDENT MEWAR, TO LIEUTENANT-COLONEL A. D. BANNERMAN, C.V.O., C.I.E., I.A., FIRST ASSISTANT TO THE AGENT TO THE GOVERNOR GENERAL, RAJPUTANA, NO. 35-C. B., DATED THE 16TH MAY 1913, (CONFIDENTIAL).

Please refer to your demi-official letter dated the 7th May 1913, with which you forwarded for my information a memorandum of grievances

submitted by the Rawat of Salumbar and in

which you enquired for Sir Elliot Colvin's information, whether I had been able to make any progress in forwarding an arrangement which will lead to the composition of the quarrels between the Darbar and the Sardars by means of an arbitrator or a board of conciliation or anything of that sort.

\* \* \* \* \*

I return, as requested, the memorandum of the Rawat of Salumbar's grievances. I have kept a copy of it for use in this office.

73. No progress has been made.

The views of the Resident are not clear. He says in one place that authoritative interference in the disputes seems desirable. But then proceeds to point out that such interference is bound to lead to frequent applications to the political authorities to enforce any settlement arrived at. It would be best if the Maharana would appoint a commission with full authority to settle the disputes. This, however, he is not likely to do unless pressed by Government, and the Thakurs would not agree to a commission nominated solely by the Maharana. The only way out would seem to be an independent commission appointed by Government. The Maharana will not apparently agree to this unless circumstances alter and the present deadlock is changed into a serious combined opposition of the Thakurs.

A. D. BANNERMAN,—23-5-1913.

AGENT TO THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL.

74. Seen. May be filed. The paper should be taken to Udaipur, when next I go there.

E. G. COLVIN,—24-5-1913.

75. FROM RAWAT UNAR SINGH OF SALUMBAR, PETITION NO. 35, DATED THE 24TH APRIL Serial No. 26 (RECEIVED 5TH MAY) 1917.

Refers to his Khat which he has presented to the Agent to the Governor General, in October 1916, regarding his grievances against the Mewar Durbar.

76. There seems to be a fresh crop of grievances in Salumbar.

Put up Salumbar's recent letter handed to me in October.

E. G. COLVIN,—5-5-1917.

77. The letter of October 1916, to which the Rawat refers, has been forwarded to the Resident, Mewar, and is not available on this file. The Rawat has recently submitted telegrams complaining against the Sarara officials. These have also been forwarded to the Resident.

Submitted as ordered at paragraph 76.

S. D. J.,—5-5-1917.

T. B. RUSSELL,—8-5-1917,

AGENT TO THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL

79. Send the new receipt to Resident, Mewar, and enquire whether any new circumstances requiring my attention have arisen.

E. G. COLVIN,—9-5-1917.

80. Draft submitted.

S. D. J.,—10-5-1917.

T. B. RUSSELL,—11-5-1917.

82. ISSUED No. 263, DATED THE 14TH MAY 1917. Serial No.

83. FROM THE RAWAT OF SALUMBAR, LETTER NO. 44, DATED THE 31ST MAY (RECEIVED 7<sup>TH</sup> JUNE) 1917. Serial No.

*Re the proposed police thanas and chowkis ordered by the Raj to be posted along the Salumbar-Dungarpur border and complaining against the Hakim of Sarara.*

84. Ask Resident for a brief report.

E. G. COLVIN,—7-6-1917.

85. Fair endorsement submitted.

S. D. J.,—12-6-1917.

T. B. RUSSELL,—13-6-1917.

87. ISSUED No. 340, DATED THE 15TH JUNE 1917. Serial No.

88. FROM RAWAT UNAR SINGH, OF SALUMBAR, MEWAR, (1) NO. 54, DATED THE 30TH JUNE, (2) DATED JULY, [RECEIVED (1) 4TH JULY, (2) 10TH JULY] 1917. Serial N. and 31

(1) Regarding his complaint against the Sarada authorities for having forced the zamindars of the petitioner's 12 villages and extorted from them written pledges to pay all rents and revenues to Sarada in future.—The aggression of the Sarada officials is increasing day by day, and growing intolerable and that he is now troubling the petitioner in various ways.

(2) States that the aggression of the Sarada officials is intolerable, no day now passes without a fresh trouble and the Mehmka khas to whom representations have been constantly made, have turned a deaf ear to the grievances and unless the Agent to the Governor General is pleased to take speedy steps to remedy the grievances his people will go against him and the Thikana will be totally ruined or his people may, being unable to bear the hardship, disturb the peace and the result may be worse.

(3) States that he has heard that the Agent to the Governor-General is shortly going away from India on retirement, he prays that the Agent to the Governor-General may kindly do something to pave the way for dispensation of justice in his cases and that before retiring he will kindly recommend the petitioner to his successor in office to keep a favourable regard for the petitioner's distressed Thikana. He is now in extreme trouble and prays that Agent to the Governor-General may kindly do something for him before he retires.

89. Kindly see paragraphs 75, 79—87. The Resident has been asked for a report on the fresh grievances of the petitioner. Papers under consideration I and II may be forwarded to the

Resident in continuation of previous correspondence and he may be asked to expedite the submission of the report called for?

90. The Agent to the Governor-General is going to visit Udaipur during the ensuing monsoon tour. This case may, therefore, be submitted again at Udaipur, in case he may like to speak to the Resident or the Durbar in connection with the Salumbar's grievances?

S. D. J.,—16-7-1917.

As proposed

T. B. RUSSELL,—17-7-1917.

AGENT TO THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL.

92. In sending these to Resident, we may say I hope he will be able to give me a report on the alleged grievances of the Rawat of Salumbar before I go to Udaipur.

E. G. COLVIN,—18-7-1917.

93. Draft endorsement with fair copy submitted.

S. D. J.,—18-7-1917.

T. B. RUSSELL,—18-7-1917.

95. ISSUED No. 401, DATED THE 18TH JULY 1917, TO RESIDENT, MEWER.

Serial No. 32

96. Memorandum of grievances dated the 9th August 1917 submitted by the Rawat of Salumbar.

Serial No. 33

97. I have told him to-day that I doubt if he really accords fullest obedience to the Durbar. Why is the Durbar so angry with him? Because whatever orders the Durbar issues, he says his rights are being trampled on. He has come from Mewar here and is proposing a visit to Central India on account of his health, but he has come without asking permission of the Durbar though he knows of the orders. These orders are wrong he says and not justified by old established custom, and none of the Sardars pay any attention to them. They may be novel orders but they are orders and therefore to be obeyed. If the Sardars object they should proceed in a constitutional manner and not merely flout the orders. This kind of conduct is the bottom of all the trouble in Salumbar's case.

E. G. COLVIN,—9-8-1917.

98. TELEGRAM FROM THE RESIDENT, MEWAR, No. 217, DATED THE 11TH AUGUST 1917.

Serial No. 34

Re grievances of the Rawat of Salumbar.

99. I have discussed this case fully with Resident and Pandit Sukhdeo Prashad.

The Resident has tabulated the grievances brought to notice by Salumbar. There are 12 of them, of which 7 are really baseless. Of the other 5 cases, 3 concern villages attached (Keli, Dantesra and Angni). The Durbar has these 3 cases still under consideration, and their proceedings will have to be watched. A fourth case concerns the location of chowkis on the Dungarpur border. This is to be settled by the Resident and Pandit Sukhdeo forming committee to consider the best positions for the chowkis with a view to checking dacoiti, irrespective of the limits of Thikanas. In the fifth case, the Durbar admit that Salumbar had no notice of the complaint brought against him in a Mewar-Dungarpur Court of Vakils. This will be brought to the notice of the Court of Vakils, who will be asked to revise their orders imposing a fine of Rs. 50 on Salumbar.

We may await Resident's official reply.

100. Sent to Resident, Mewar, with endorsement No. 946-C, dated the 16th August 1917.

I add two more petitions received yesterday from Salumbar. These may be sent to Resident for disposal.

101. There is some reason to suppose that the present Hakim of the Magra is disposed to deal with Salumbar cases with undue severity. The Maharana favours the Hakim, and is unlikely to agree to his removal; but I have told Pandit Sukhdeo to point out to the Maharana that the Hakim's actions, if unrestrained, may re-act unfavourably on the Durbar, and that it would be advisable to give him a warning to this effect.

E. G. COLVIN,—15-8-1917.

Udaipur.

S. A. G. G. Rai.

**102.** I have also let the Maharana know that I have warned Salumbar personally\* that I do not think his attitude towards the Durbar has been marked by a proper spirit of subordination, and that if he really hopes to effect a reconciliation with the Durbar, there must be a radical change of attitude on his part.

**103.** LETTER FROM RAWAT OF SALUMBAR, DATED THE 15TH AUGUST 1917.

*Complains that the Hakim of Sarara has posted sepoys in Rathori and Pongawra villages of Salumbar and that the Mehmka Khas does not take any action for removing them. Prays that the sepoys may be removed as he apprehends loss in revenue, etc.*

**104.** Send to Resident in continuation of previous correspondence. The point which Salumbar's representatives brought to my notice yesterday was that Salumbar was quite ready to post his own horsemen and sepoy at any chowkis in Salumbar but that the Mewar Durbar would not allow him to do so.

E. G. COLVIN,—16-8-1917.

**105.** Fair endorsement submitted for signature.

G. C. J.—16-8-1917.

B. J. GLANCY,—17-8-1917.

**107.** ISSUED No. 468, DATED THE 21ST AUGUST 1917.

**108.** TELEGRAM FROM THE RESIDENT, MEWAR, NO. 262, DATED THE 14TH (RECEIVED 18TH) SEPTEMBER 1917.

Serial No.

*Forwards a detailed report on the grievances of the Rawat of Salumbar against the Mewar Durbar.*

**109.** Kindly see paragraphs 75 and 87 *supra*.

Kindly see also orders at paragraphs 99 and 102 which were recorded at Udaipur.

**110.** The Resident's report dealing with 8 different cases which form the subject-matter of the Rawat's grievances, may be summarised as under:—

(i) *Re* Village Kelai. The Salumbar appeal is under Durbar's consideration.

(ii) *Re* Village Dantari. Since the Agent to the Governor General's recent visit to Udaipur the Durbar have ordered Salumbar to put forward all his proofs to substantiate his claim to this village.

(iii) *Re* Establishment by the Durbar of Police outposts on the Salumbar-Dungarpur border at Rathri and Pangamra. The Rawat complains that in obedience to the Mehmka Khas orders he sent his Police to these places, but the Hakim of Magra deputed Durbar Sowars at these places and that the latter's aggressiveness has even cost the life of one of the Salumbar sepoys, and that the cost of the Durbar Police at these two places is debited against Salumbar. The Resident's own opinion is that it is desirable to establish a third Police outpost at Bhabrana, in addition to an intermediate between those at Rathri and Pangaura. The Salumbar sepoy's death, it is admitted by Salumbar, had been caused accidentally by careless handling of his gun by a Raj sower. The Durbar propose to make further inquiries through Rai Bahadur Pundit Sukhdeo Prasad in consultation with the Resident about the site for location of these Police outposts. As regards the recovery of the cost of establishing these Police outposts, kindly see paragraph 4 of paper under consideration, it would appear that the Durbar are justified to do so but the Resident considers it would be more regular and in accordance with custom for the Durbar to attach a Salumbar village and use the proceeds to cover the cost of their Police outposts, rather than to make direct collection from Salumbar tenants.

(iv) The Hakim of Magra, the Rawat complains, instigates Isarwas Thakur and assists him in his insubordination towards Salumbar and has sent Raj sowers to Manpur and they and the Isarwas men are oppressing the people.

The Resident says that it is impossible to form any adequate opinion without making personal inquiry on the spot as the relations between Isarwas and Salumbar are just as strained as are those of the Salumbar and Durbar.

(v) *Re* Salumbar's complaint against the present Boundary Settlement Office, Mewar.

The Resident considers that the Rawat's attitude was very unwise in refusing to send his representative to appear before the Boundary Settlement Officer.

- (vi) *Re* salt compensation withheld by Durbar since 1901. The Resident considers that there seems no objection to the action of the Durbar provided that money is actually due by Salumbar to the Darbar Treasury and that due credit for the same is given in the State accounts.
- (vii) *Re* Salumbar's complaint that the Hakim of Magra has declared Anjni Village (of Salumbar) to be a hamlet of the Khalsa Village Agar. The matter is under enquiry in Mehmka Khas.
- (viii) *Re* Salumbar contention that he should perform service with the Durbar for 3 months in the year and not for 12 months as the Durbar claim that he should. The Resident does not express his own opinion in the matter in express words but has referred to the various Qaulnamahs and old correspondence. The latest Qaulnamah of 1854-55 which had been subsequently abrogated shows that the Salumbar Thikana does not pay chhatund but performs service at the capital for 12 months. Colonel Pinhey's note of 1903 also shows that Salumbar is bound to serve 12 months at Udaipur, as he enjoys exemption from Talwar Bandhai fee and chhatund.

**111.** All the references in the paper under consideration and the Resident's detailed report enclosed therewith have been marked except the Government of India's despatch to the Court of Directors, No. 36 of 7th August 1848, (which has been referred to in the Resident's detailed report on point viii) which is not traceable on our files.

**112.** It will be seen from paragraph 110 above that cases 1, 3 and 7 are under enquiry by Durbar and that Nos. 2, 4, 5 and 6 require no notice—case No. viii is the only question of great importance regarding which decision is sought.

**113.** Regarding the Salumbar Rawat's grievances against the Hakim of Magra *re* oppression, the Resident is inclined to think that the Maharana is sometimes inclined to lend too ready credence to exaggerated reports made by the Hakim and to sanction measures which he would not have countenanced if he had been made fully aware of the same facts of the case by a more trustworthy and impartial District Officer—*vide* concluding sentence of paragraph 4 of the Resident's letter under note. It would therefore seem that the Salumbar's complaints against the Hakim are not altogether groundless.

Submitted for orders.

S. D. J.,—29-10-1917.

**114.** *Paragraphs 108 to 113.*—Resident might perhaps be asked to report after 3 months, or sooner if there are any important developments, as to how cases 1, 2, 3 and 7 stand.

**115.** Case 6 is really a question of accounts and there does not seem to be any prospect of a settlement of it or case 8, unless some further attempt to reconcile Salumbar and the Durbar is made.

T. B. RUSSELL, 31-10-17.

AGENT TO THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL.

**116.** Regarding Nos. 1, 2 and 7 we may reply as proposed at 114 above, adding that I hope the Resident will be able to keep himself informed as to the Durbar's proceedings in the matter, and that he will be able also to obtain from the Durbar a promise that final orders will not be passed on any of these three cases, until the Resident and, if necessary, the Agent to the Governor-General have had an opportunity of being informed of the circumstances and of acquiescing in the orders proposed.

*No. 3.*—We may say the Agent to the Governor-General is glad to hear that the Durbar propose to make further enquiries through Pandit Sukhdeo Prashad, in consultation with the Resident as to the sites for the location of the police posts.

I agree with him that the co-ordinated protection of the whole frontier can probably be carried out better by the Durbar than by different jagirdars, without the Durbar or in combination with the Durbar. It does not however appear necessary or desirable that any Jagirdar village should be attached in order to recover the costs, until a clear necessity arises. Ordinarily the presentation of bills to the jagirdars should suffice, and it should only be when this method fails that recourse should be had to stronger measures.

*No. 4.*—It would seem that the Hakim of the Magra should be called on by the Durbar to justify his action in sending Raj sowars to Manpur.

*No. 5.*—No particular case of a prejudicial decision by the Boundary Settlement Officer has been brought to notice, and we cannot take any action on a general complaint of this nature.

*No. 6.*—It appears to be for the Rawat of Salumbar to make good his allegation that nazrana and fines imposed on the people of his State by the Durbar should be retained by the Thikana. The Resident might reasonably use his influence to get this question properly adjudicated.

No. 5.—I fancy it is true that, in view of his being the hereditary "Banggaria" Salumbar (Udaipur) (*sic.*) is expected to be liable to remain on service for the whole 12 months, if the Maharana so desire. I told Salumbar when I saw him in Udaipur in August last that by resisting this claim he was not likely to improve his prospects of getting his other grievances settled by the Durbar. He admits that the Maharana is his lord and master but argues that his lord and master cannot take service from him for more than three months. His position is not really logical. It is most unlikely that the Durbar would really keep him on continuous service for 12 months.

**117.** I have shown Mr. Holme my remark at paragraph 101 above, but they may also be communicated to him in a separate demi-official.

E. G. COLVIN,—9-11-1917.

**118.** Two drafts as ordered at paragraphs 116 and 117 submitted.

S. D. J.,—10-11-1917.

T. B. RUSSELL,—12-11-1917.

**120.** ISSUED NO. 609, DATED THE 14TH NOVEMBER 1917.

Serial No.

**121.** DEMI-OFFICIAL FROM T. B. RUSSELL, ESQ., SECOND ASSISTANT TO AGENT TO THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL, RAJPUTANA, TO A. T. HOLME, ESQ., I.C.S., RESIDENT, DATED 14TH NOVEMBER 1917.

In continuation of this office letter No. 609 <sub>31</sub>, of the same date, regarding the grievances of the Rawat of Salumbar against the Maharana, I am desired to subjoin a copy of remarks which Sir Elliot recorded at Udaipur on August 15th, 1917, and which he has already shown to you:—

"There is some reason to suppose that the present Hakim of the Magra is disposed to deal with Salumbar cases with undue severity. The Maharana favours the Hakim, and is unlikely to agree to his removal; but I have told Pandit Sukhdeo to point out to the Maharana that the Hakim's actions, if unrestrained, may re-act unfavourably on the Durbar, and that it would be advisable to give him a warning to this effect."

**122.**

SALUMBÄR.

THE MEMORANDUM OF MY GRIEVANCES.

1. *The Run of Jaisamand.*—This matter has been finally decided by the Government of India—*vide* letter No. 1064-I. A., dated the 24th May 1911, from the Assistant Secretary to the Government of India in the Foreign Department, to the Hon'ble the Agent to the Governor-General.

2. *The loss of customs.*—*Vide* paragraph 3 of letter No. 186, dated the 18th July 1912, from the Resident in Mewar to the First Assistant to the Hon'ble the Agent to the Governor-General.

3. *Interference in my judicial powers.*—*Vide* the attached Notes recorded by the Hon'ble the Agent to the Governor-General (Sir Elliot Colvin) and the Resident in Mewar (Lieutenant-Colonel Kaye).

4. *Interference in the Sasnik villages.*—*Vide* paragraph 6 of letter No. 186, dated the 18th July 1912, from the Resident in Mewar to the First Assistant to the Hon'ble the Agent to the Governor-General.

5. *Confiscation of the three of my villages without any reason, namely, Amarpura, Khumanpura and Kailai.*

*Mauza Khumanpura.*—The Rawat of Salumbar was told by Lieutenant-Colonel Kaye (Resident in Mewar) in 1914 that the dispute about Khumanpura was not one in which the Resident could interfere.

*Mauza Amarpura.*—This village was made khalsa by the Durbar owing to the Rawat's failure to attend at Udaipur for his service in spite of repeated orders being issued to him.

*Mauza Kailai.*—*Vide* correspondence ending with First Assistant to the Agent to the Governor-General's letter No. 609 <sub>31-Mewar</sub>, dated the 14th November 1917 (paragraph 2), to the Resident in Mewar.

6. *Setting up boundary disputes with many villages the revenue of my land is being taken away.*—No specific instance is given by the Rawat. A reference may be made to the

correspondence ending with paragraph 4 of letter No. ~~609~~  
31-Mewar, dated the 14th November 1917, from the First Assistant to the Hon'ble the Agent to the Governor-General to the Resident in Mewar.

7. *The Hakim of Magra has instigated many of my Jagirdars to be disloyal to me and for this reason they have given up my service —* Vide item 4 in the Appendix to letter No. 262, dated the 14th September 1917, from the Resident in Mewar to the First Assistant to the Agent to the Governor-General.

8. *Besides these there are other grievances of mine, the papers of which are lying in the Residency office as well as in your Honour's office.*

*Kindly bestow upon me the favour of doing me justice.* — The grievances of the Rawat of Salumbar against the Durbar, and of the Durbar against the Rawat, provide the material for masses of files in the Mewar Residency Office. The probability is that hardly any of them will be settled in the life-time of the present Maharana and the present Rawat.

A. T. HOLME, — 23-2-1918,

Resident, Mewar.

**123.** I have spoken to Pandit Sukhdeo Prasad on the subject and now learnt for the first time the real meaning of the refusal of the Mejkma Khas to receive letters containing certain words and of the protest of the Salumbar Rao against their action, which is as follows.

As we know well His Highness the Maharana has tortured the meaning of the Kalam-bandhi to be that only those Sardars who agreed to be bound by its terms are entitled to exercise any judicial powers within their Thikanas. His Highness, therefore argues, that as the Salumbar Rao did not agree to the Kalam-bandhi he has no judicial powers to exercise. Consequently all references to his exercising such powers are improper and he is not allowed to refer to 'Courts', 'Judicial proceedings', 'Judicial officers', etc., as being in existence in his Thikana.

To maintain the Durbar's view no communications containing words which presume he exercises judicial powers will be received.

This has been repeatedly explained to the Salumbar Vakil by the Mejkma Khas and Rawat Onar Singh is well aware of the position. His protests are therefore with a view to getting his judicial rights, as he holds these to be acknowledged.

Pandit Sukhdeo Prasad tells me that as a matter of fact he does receive and deal with many replies from Salumbar in which such words occur but often the letters addressed by the 'Punjdaran and Kamdaran Salumbar' to the Mejkma Khas (a superior office) are very wanting in courtesy and these he will not accept.

I shall take no action on this khat and will explain to the Rao of Salumbar why I do not do so.

File.

J. L. KAYE, — 14-9-1915,

Resident, Mewar.

These notes deal with one of the Salumbar Rawat's usual complaints against the Durbar, and my note of the 14th instant explains the matter. But in this connection R. B. Pandit Sukhdeo Prasad asked me to consult you as to addressing His Highness the Maharana in regard to the exercise of judicial powers by the Mewar Sardars who did not sign the Kalambandhi.

These sardars have always exercised judicial powers within their Thikanas and still do so. The Durbar tries to stop them exercising these powers and this is the chief cause of friction between the Sardars and the Durbar. The Panditji holds that till the extent of the right to exercise jurisdiction has been settled in connection with the Mewar Committee, or by other means, the Maharana should be asked not to take any strong measures against Sardars on the grounds that they are illegally exercising judicial powers in their estates.

J. L. KAYE, — 18-9-1915.

AGENT TO THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL.

As explained to you verbally, I think it better not to talk about this to His Highness, at any rate, until we see signs of his taking strong measures against any Sirdar.

E. G. COLVIN, — 18-9-1915,

Agent to the Governor-General, Rajputana.

RESIDENT MEWAR.

I will explain Agent to the Governor-General's views to R. B. Pandit Sukhdeo Prasad when I see him again. These papers may be filed.

J. L. KAYE, — 19-9-1915.

First Assistant.

124. Please see Resident in Mewar's note on the grievances of the Rao of Salumbar's memorandum of grievances.

Please have the actual papers referred to put up with these for me to see.

If they are at Abu the file can be submitted there early in April.

J. MANNERS-SMITH,—26-2-1918.

125. The file is put up in accordance with Agent to the Governor General's orders at paragraph 124 above.

B. S. GLANCY,—16-3-1918,

Agent to the Governor General.

126. FROM THE RESIDENT, MEWAR, No. <sup>83</sup>17-38-04, DATED THE 15TH (RECEIVED 18TH) MARCH 1918. Serial

*Regarding the complaints of the Rawat of Salumbar against the Mewar Durbar.*

127. FROM RAWAT OF SALUMBAB, DATED AND RECEIVED THE 19TH MARCH 1918.

Serial No.

*Regarding his complaints against the Mewar Durbar.*

128. Kindly see paragraphs 110 and 116 to 120 *supra*. Paper under consideration I may be filed *pro tem* as the Resident will furnish a further report on the Salumbar complaints I, II, VII and VI when the cases have been finally settled (*vide* paragraphs 2 and 5 of paper under consideration I).

129. Paper under consideration II is a petition from the Rao of Salumbar but it does not bear his signature, and as such need not be considered and may, perhaps, be simply filed. It does not contain any fresh grievances but is a recapitulation of his old numerous complaints except those referred to in paragraphs 9 and 10 of the petition.

S. D. J.,—19-7-1918.

130. May be filed? It does not appear that any action can profitably be taken at present.

131. B. G. GLANCY,—20-7-1918.

J. MANNERS SMITH,—21-7-1918.

132. FROM RAWAT UNAR SINGH OF SALUMBAR, No. 7, DATED THE 25TH (RECEIVED 29TH) JANUARY 1920.

*Regarding his grievances against the Mewar Durbar in respect of his Thikana lands submerged in the Jaisamand lake.*

133. The dispute about compensation for the land of the Salumbar Thikana villages submerged in the Jaisamand lake, the Rawat says, is of a long standing and that the decision arrived at by the Raj in Sawat year 1932, 1875-1876-A. D was erroneous. It is added that the Rawat submitted detailed representation on 13th January 1920, claiming compensation for the submerged area had been returned by the officials of Mehkma khas with the remark that the same could not be accepted. Adds that the original petition returned by Mehkma khas has been submitted to the Resident, Mewar, for consideration.

The petitioner prays that the Agent to the Governor-General may be pleased to take the necessary action in petitioners favour in respect to the strange attitude of the Mehkma khas official in regard to the Rawat's communications.

134. The dispute about the Jaisamand Run lands has been of a long standing and the Rawat has been petitioning since 1912.

135. Perhaps the Agent to the Governor-General may like to discuss this case with His Highness at Udaipur unless the petition be forwarded to Resident, Mewar, for disposal.

S. D. J.,—6-2-1920.

136. As the Resident, Mewar, is already dealing with the case it might not be advisable to mention it to His Highness. It may be forwarded to the Resident with the remark that it is understood he is already dealing with the matter and that the Agent to the Governor-General will be glad to hear the result of his investigations.

R. R. MACONACHIE,—6-2-1920.

R. E. HOLLAND,—7-2-1920.

137. AGENT TO THE GOVERNOR GENERAL.

138. Fair endorsement submitted.

139. S. D. J.,—7-2-1920.

AKHEY SINGH,—7-2-1920.

140.

ISSUED NO. 695-C, DATED THE 9TH FEBRUARY 1920.

141. CONFIDENTIAL DEMI-OFFICIAL NO. 7C. DATED THE 27TH FEBRUARY 1920, FROM LT.-COLONEL

P. T. SPENCE, RESIDENT, MEWAR, TO R. R. MACONACHIE, ESQ., I.C.S., FIRST ASSISTANT  
TO THE HON'BLE THE AGENT TO THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL IN RAJPUTANA, AGENCY CAMP.

Please refer to your endorsement No. 695-C., dated the 9th February 1920, forwarding

Paragraph 140 above. an English petition, No. 7, dated the 25th  
January 1920, from Rawat Onar Singh of Salumbar to the address of Mr. Holland.

2. Not long before he petitioned Mr. Holland in this manner, Rawat Onar Singh had treated me to a somewhat similar effusion, upon which I instructed my office to prepare a detailed note.

3. That note took a long time to prepare and did not come up to me until my return from tour a few days ago.

4. I now send it in original for Mr. Holland's perusal in order that he may see how matters stand, and I shall be glad if it is returned for record in my office when done with.

To put matters frankly and boldly I may tell you that, since my assumption of charge I have not attempted to address myself to the seemingly impossible task of settling the differences between the Rawat of Salumbar and the Mewar Durbar.

6. My passive attitude has not been due to apathy or a desire to shirk an unpleasant duty.

7. But Mr. Holme, on handing over to me, informed me that, in the present temper of the parties concerned, it was quite hopeless to approach the question with any chance of success.

8. A very short term of office as Resident in Mewar was sufficient to convince me of the correctness of Mr. Holme's opinion.

9. Moreover, the Rawat of Salumbar never visited Udaipur between April and October of last year and, when he did come in the latter month, he was so ill that my meeting with him was limited to the occasion of his formal introductory visit and one subsequent visit.

10. It was after his second visit that he sent me in the list of grievances which forms the subject of the enclosed note. Prior to my return from tour he became so ill that he obtained permission from His Highness to proceed to Debra Dun and Lucknow for medical treatment in accordance with the advice of the Residency Surgeon.

11. His illness takes the form of acute kidney trouble and I understand that he is to be skinned by means of X-Rays.

12. I trust that the foregoing narrative will suffice to convince Mr. Holland of the impossibility of my attempting to go into this question with the Rawat of Salumbar.

13. To have attempted to do so with the Maharana would have been impolitic in the last degree, as it requires a minimum of sagacity to see that His Highness has not been in the mood for any dispassionate discussion of Salumbar affairs within the past year.

14. In fact mutual relations are so embittered that it is my considered opinion that no satisfactory solution will be effected during the lifetime of either the present Maharana or the present Rawat of Salumbar. Without "give and take" and an attitude of conciliation one cannot expect much, and both of the parties are unbending and obdurate on certain initial points upon the settlement of which all else depends.

15. First and foremost of these comes the question of the length of service due to His Highness by the Rawat.

16. The Maharana insists that the Rawat should render 12 months' service per annum. Sir Elliot Colvin, Mr. Holme and Colonel Kaye appear to have been unanimous in inclining to the belief that His Highness contention in this respect is correct.

17. The Rawat in his turn insists that he is not liable to render more than 3 months service per annum just as almost all of the other Nobles are liable to render.

18. The general opinion is that if the Rawat were to admit his liability to render 12 month's service per annum, His Highness would not actually require him to render longer service than the rest of the Nobles. But neither will give in.

19. It is also generally agreed that the Hakim of the Magra, whom the Maharana holds in high favour, loses no opportunity of accentuating the differences between the Rawat and the Durbar. Mr. Holme frequently advised His Highness to transfer the Hakim to another district but to no purpose.

20. Again the Rawat is very badly served by his own officials who keep his difficulties with the Durbar 'going' by representing everything in the most unfavourable light and thereby posing as ultra loyal servants of their master. It is only natural that the Rawat should believe his own servants' version of all that is represented to him, with the result that his grievances against the Durbar increase and multiply.

21. Another very serious difficulty in the way of attempting to achieve anything in this direction for more than a year past has been the return of Pandit Sukhdeo Prasad to Jodhpur and the consequent absence of any responsible person in Udaipur, save His Highness himself, with whom the Resident can discuss such questions as those which form the subject of this letter.

22. As Mr. Holland is aware, His Highness spends many months of the year away from his capital and, in the absence of a responsible Minister, has no one whom he can or will trust to go into a delicate and far-reaching question of this sort with the Resident.

23. To expect His Highness himself to take up the matter seriously, would involve an amount of work which it would take him months on end to accomplish.

24. Unless, therefore, Mr. Holland considers that the matter is one of sufficient urgency to call for prompt action I would counsel the indefinite postponement of its further consideration or at any rate until such time as that is forced upon us by exceptional circumstances.

25. My private opinion is that the Rawat of Salumbar has not long to live.

26. He looked wretchedly ill when I last saw him and his kidney trouble was so acute from October (when he came here for service) up to January (when he left for Dehra Dun and Lucknow) that he was virtually bed-ridden all the time and bore the appearance of being moribund. It remains to be seen what X-Rays will reveal probably that surgical operative treatment is essential to any chance of recovery.

27. When I add that a bad attack of dysentery supervened before he went away it will be understood that poor Rawat of Salumbar is to be pitied.

28. In the circumstances explained, I think it will be conceded that the time is not yet for attempting to tackle this exceedingly complex and thorny question which appears, for all practical purposes, to have remained *in statu quo* since June 1911, when the orders of Government on the Rawat's Memorial, "Part I regarding the Jaisamand Run" were received. (see your office letter No. 102-P., dated the 7th June 1911, with enclosures).

29. The 'pious hope' expressed by Sir Elliot Colvin in the concluding portion of paragraph 8 of his letter No. 65. P., dated the 9th May 1911, to the Government of India in the Foreign Department concerning the four remaining memorials of the Rawat of Salumbar has neither materialised nor progressed substantially since then for reasons which are recorded in your office as a result of negotiations between the Agent to the Governor-General, the Maharana and the Resident on the occasion of successive tours in Mewar and discussions *in situ*.

**142.** FROM THE RAWAT OF SALUMBAR, PETITION DATED THE 22ND APRIL 1920, (RECEIVED 14<sup>th</sup> MAY 1920). Serial No.

*Intimates that he is asking Mr. Magan Lal, Bar-at-Law to represent his cases to the Agent to the Governor-General.*

**143.** Presented by Mr. Magan Lal to-day. I understand the Rawat is submitting an application. R. A. E. BENN, —14-5-1920.

**144.** What status has Mr. Magan Lal got? Put up Mr. Holland's remarks that we do not recognise the right of council to appear in political cases. R. R. MACONACHIE, —12-6-1920.

**145.** For Mr. Holland's orders referred to above, kindly see paragraphs 4, 17, 18-20 of notes to Sirohi Miscellaneous file XVI-93 submitted below.

**146.** Mr. Magan Lal, Bar-at-Law, has no standing in political cases. Even in the Panchayat court cases which are mostly of legal nature, a legal practitioner is not allowed to appear in his capacity of a legal adviser except in very rare cases of exceptional character, *vide* paragraphs 12-18 of notes to file 245 General V. O.

S. D. J., —15-6 1920.

**147.** From paragraph 132. Resident, Mewar's demi-official letter and office note show that the grievances of the Rawat of Salumbar have received full attention but that the matter is at a deadlock (paragraphs 7, 14-24 of letter). There seems no probability of any settlement until the death of the present Rawat. The matter may be postponed indefinitely, in accordance with Mr. Holme's and Colonel Spence's opinion. Resident may be informed accordingly, demi-officially. Resident's office note may be returned to him.

**148.** AGENT TO THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL.

R. R. MACONACHIE, —17-6-1920.

Yes.

R. A. E. BENN, —17-6-1920.

**149.** Draft demi-official submitted. S. D. J., —17-6-1920.

**150.** S. Q. M. G. I.

R. R. MACONACHIE, —18-6-1920.

151. DEMI-OFFICIAL FROM R. R. MACONACHIE, ESQ., FIRST ASSISTANT TO THE AGENT TO THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL, RAJPUTANA, TO W. H. J. WILKINSON, ESQ., C.I.E., I.C.S., RESIDENT, MEWAR, NO. 473-P. O., DATED MOUNT ABU, THE 22ND JUNE 1920.

Please refer to Colonel Spence's demi-official letter\* No. 7-C., of the 27th February 1920,

\* Paragraph 141, *ante*. regarding the grievances of Rawat Onar Singh of Salumbar. Colonel Benn agrees in the opinion held by Mr. Holme and Colonel Spence that the matter may be postponed indefinitely.

Your office note which was received with the demi-official under reply, is returned herewith.



## Appendix to Notes.

### Salumbar Affairs.

#### AGENT TO THE GOVERNOR GENERAL—

I think you may wish to read the letter\* below from the Rawat of Salumbar in which he states that he proposes to coerce his refractory

\*No. 2-14-15, dated the 16th July, 1914.

sub-jagirdars. I fancy there is no doubt that

the Darbar's khalsa officials—the Hakim of the Magra Zillah, etc.—back the jagirdars in flouting the authority of the Rawat and I have spoken to His Highness on the subject and said that should trouble occur between the Rawat and his jagirdars and this be traced to the machinations of his officials, the Darbar must incur serious responsibility.

I trust that the talked-of Sardars' Committee will do something to straighten out the troubles of the Salumbar Rao.

J. L. KAYE,—6-8-1914,

*Resident, Mewar.*

Salumbar might be advised to postpone coercive measures, until middle of cold weather, by which time some developments may have occurred.

Some of the offences in the list are rather trifling, e.g., killing a pig in a reserve. He would be wise to limit his charges to the more serious cases.

E. G. COLVIN,—6-8-1914,

*Agent to the Governor-General Rajputana.*

I have drafted to the Rawatji of Salumbar.

J. L. KAYE,—9-8-1914,

*Resident, Mewar.*

#### ISSUED LETTER NO 1425, DATED THE 11TH AUGUST 1914, TO THE RAWAT OF SALUMBAR.

The Salumbar Rao came to see me on Friday last (2nd October 1914). He talked of—

(a) his application for leave to arrange for his daughter's wedding to the Sailana

Kunwar in November not having yet been granted by the Darbar.

(b) his failure to obtain a loan for the purpose of (a)—

He said he would not ask the Darbar for a loan and that no Sahukar would let him have the money without a guarantee of repayment (khatri) from the Residency. I told him again, as I had previously, that this could not be granted by me,

(c) The rumour that there was a quarrel between the Raja of Sailana and his eldest son, which might affect the marriage,

(d) Boundary disputes being manufactured against the Thikana and improper interference by the Sarara Hakim in his Thikana,

(e) Interference by the Magra Hakim in the jagir villages granted by the Thikana to ladies of the Salumbar family. 'Kunta' in these villages was being made by the Hakim, which was an improper interference, such being always done by the Thikana authorities.

and (f) the rumour of a Committee having been appointed to deal with the Sardars' grievances. He had heard that the Maharaja Holkar of Indore and the Maharao of Kotah were members. The Sardars claimed to have two representatives. The Sardars had not been consulted. They must be informed of what cases would be taken up and given time to prepare these, etc.

I did not promise any interference with regard to (d) and (e) and refused information about (f) merely saying that if he believed the rumour, he could not do better than proceed to get his case prepared for possible discussion.

File.

J. L. KAYE,—5-10-1914,

*Resident, Mewar.*

#### LETTER NO. 4, DATED THE 8TH SEPTEMBER 1915, FROM THE RAWAT OF SALUMBAR.

Intimates that certain jagirdars under his estate have been disregarding his authority and defying the estate's orders deliberately, but that he has taken no steps against them as yet, as he had been advised by the Hon'ble the Agent to the Governor General and the

Resident to take no strong measures against the Jagirdars for a time and to keep patience. Adds that the Jagirdar of Isarwas has become very disobedient and uses very objectionable language in letters, etc., addressed by him to the Salumbar Thikana, etc., etc. Also submits a statement showing the Jagirdar of Isarwas' defiant attitude towards the Thikana.

Put up with previous correspondence at Agent to the Governor-General's visit.

J. L. KAYE,—9-9-1915,

Resident, Mewar.

AGENT TO THE GOVERNOR GENERAL—

The question of the relations existing between the Rawat of Salumbar and some of his subordinate jagirdars was brought to your notice a year ago, when, under your orders the letter marked "A" was written to the Rao. Matters between him and his jagirdars have not improved since last year and, as will be noticed, he again asks that any steps which he may take to enforce obedience from them will have our approval.

As you are going to give the Rao an interview to-day, perhaps you may think fit to tell him that the intention of His Highness the Maharana to hold the Mewar Committee is not dead (as His Highness intimated to you on Saturday) and he would still be wise to exercise patience till that Committee has assembled and dealt with the matters which will be referred to it.

J. L. K[AYE],—20-9-1915,

Resident Mewar.

RESIDENT—

A year has passed and I should think several more may pass before Salumbar's cases are settled by the Enquiry Committee. If the facts are correctly stated in the enclosure to Salumbar's letter, some of these cases are pretty bad, e.g., Nos. 7 and 10. In these cases, the State authorities have apparently called on the Salumbar estate to recover fines imposed on persons in the subordinate jagirs, thereby admitting Salumbar's position as regards them. The jagirdars have sent insolent replies.

I should be disposed in cases such as these to ask the Darbar to let Salumbar assert his authority over the Jagirdars, otherwise State business is impeded and State authority, as well as that of Salumbar, is flouted. The circumstances of any case in which Salumbar wishes to proceed against the jagirdars should be carefully examined.

I did not see this file, unfortunately, till after my interview with Salumbar yesterday, as he did not specially refer to these cases. I am keeping a copy of these notes for record in my office.

E. G. COLVIN,—21-9-1915,

Agent to the Governor-General, Rajputana.

PARTICULARS OF CASES IN WHICH THE JAGIRDAR WAS SERVED WITH THE ESTATE'S ORDERS.				PARTICULARS OF THE ORDERS WHICH THE JAGIRDAR WAS CALLED UPON TO CARRY OUT.				PARTICULARS SHOWING HOW THE JAGIRDAR DEFIED ORDERS.			
No.	Name of plaintiff.	Name of defendant.	Matter.	Circumstances under which the orders were issued.	No. of orders.	Date of the order.	Purport of orders.	Date of Jagirdar's reply.	Purport of the Jagirdar's reply.		
7	Megha, son of Guga of Datho Dharawad Mewar.	Kesia son of Brij Megha formerly of Pahada now residing in Badel, Sarawas Sulumber.	Theft of a buffalo.	The Girwa Hakim Mewar imposed a penalty of Rs. 10/- on the Jagirdar unless the Jagirdar produced the accused within 3 months. On failure of the Jagirdar in complying with that order the Girwa Hakim asked the estate to recover the penalty.	1702 from Sudar Katchery, Sulumber.	Sambat 14th, Sambat 1971 (12th May 1915).	The Jagirdar had been asked by letter No. 542 of 16th October 1914 to pay up the penalty as he had failed to produce the accused. The Jagirdar returned the letter with an insulting endorsement. So this letter No. 1702 of 12th May 1915, was written to warn the Jagirdar against such liberty in future and to call for the payment.	Jeth Vid. 11th Sambat 1971 (8th June 1915).	The endorsement made by the Jagirdar is as under: The original to be returned with intimation that although a reply was given from this estate why it is questioned where the Asani is. If he be in the country of Mewar, write to Mewar and if he be in any other State, write there. It is rejected that, even when I don't know where he is, how can I trace him. His trace will be made by you only.		
10	The State	Giana Mina of Babrana under Bhadesar.	Theft in Manpur	This case dates from 993 from Sudar Katchery, Sulumber.	Maha Sudi, 2nd, 1971.	Fagan Sud, 4th Sambat, 1971.	The Jagirdar asked the Jagirdar to recover Rs. 20/- of fines imposed on certain Bhils of Manpur.	To be returned to say that why such Bograia letters being sent and are written in unintelligible hand-writing. So it seems that you are ill-disposed, send therefore as usual.			



# RAJPUTANA AGENCY.

## POLITICAL BRANCH.

### GRIEVANCES OF THE RAWAT OF SALUMBAR AGAINST MEWAR. MISCELLANEOUS DISPUTES WITH THE MEWAR DARBAR (MAIN FILE).

#### 1

Letter No. 465, dated Udaipur, the 23rd December 1907.

From—C. H. A. HILL, Esq., C.I.E., I.C.S., Resident, Mewar,  
To—C. C. WATSON, Esq., I.C.S., First Assistant to the Hon'ble the Agent to the Governor-General,  
Rajputana.

I have the honour to invite a reference to Major Pinhey's official letter No. 412, dated 23rd August 1906, regarding the Salumbar *Matampursi* case, in which he made certain recommendations as to the action to be taken in the event of the Mewar Darbar not proceeding in the manner which the circumstances, as then known, seemed to indicate as correct.

2. The Honourable the Agent to the Governor-General consented to defer any action thereon, pending the result of an enquiry into the rights of the case which I had undertaken to conduct; and I have now the honour to submit for his information the results of the enquiry.

3. The proceedings are compiled under the following five headings, *viz*,—

- (1) *Matampursi*.
- (2) Interference by the Darbar with Salumbar's powers in the administration of justice.
- (3) Run (the alluvial of the Dhebar Lake).
- (4) Minor Complaints.
- (5) Conclusions.

As all the claims, counter-claims, evidence and results are therein set forth at (I regret to say) great length, I do not propose to recapitulate them in this letter, but to confine myself to reporting, for the Honourable the Agent to the Governor-General's information my subsequent proceedings.

4. Having assured myself that the Hon'ble Mr. Colvin was generally disposed to concur in the conclusions set forth in the memoranda of enquiry, I felt myself at liberty to proceed towards a settlement of the *Matampursi* case which is the crux of the whole trouble. I therefore read out a translation of my conclusions in section V, very slightly modified to meet the circumstances, to His Highness the Maharana, who accepted the views in their entirety.

5. In pursuance of part of the proposals therein contained, I proceeded, on the 14th December, from Jaisamund to Salumbar to interview the Rawat of Salumbar. In order that there might be no possibility of misunderstanding, I transcribed, and read out to him, the gist of my conclusions, in the words set forth in the accompaniment (A) to this letter.

6. The Rawat accepted the finding on the *Matampursi* question so philosophically that I am driven to the conclusion that he was aware that there was, to say the least of it, a doubt as to the validity of the documents on which he relied. Indeed as in eliciting the callousness with which the forgery of documents is apparently regarded in Salumbar, I think I ought to report that he then proceeded to suggest that, since I had found that there were mistakes in those documents, how will, if I would give him time, produce others "of a similar kind." It was for this reason partly, that I was compelled to communicate to him the warning contained in the final paragraph of enclosure (A) of which it is necessary to give some explanation for the Hon'ble Mr. Colvin's information.

7. In the course of the proceedings (last June) I learnt that, in Mihir Singh's time, the then Rawat had put forward precisely similar claims which had been disposed of by the Darbar. On enquiry I found that the evidence then adduced had been demonstrated to

S A G G R I J.

---

 Serial No. 1] Grievances of the Rawat of Salumbar against Mewar.
 

---

be a forgery; and, as I thought it possible that it might be the same evidence as is now adduced, I asked to see the proceedings. I have the honour to attach a translation (marked 'B') of an abstract of in the first column, Salumbar's claims as then stated, and in the second (i) the Darbar's reply, and (ii) the comments added now by His Highness. From these it is clear that, having failed, 40 years ago, to establish their rights on the strength of one set of forgeries, the Salumbar people set to work and drew up another—and the latter were more skilful and far more difficult to refute, requiring a close examination of history and dates. In these circumstances, I conceived it essential, if there were ever to be a settlement of this *Matampuri* claim, to inform the Rawat, in the most unmistakeable language, that no further evidence would be attended to. I was fortified in this conclusion by the circumstance that, when at Salumbar, last March, I took the precaution, at the end of our three days' examination of papers, to ask the Rawat whether he had any other evidence to produce, and he told me he had given me all that existed with any bearing on the claims then at stake. I trust that, in the circumstances, not only will the Hon'ble the Agent to the Governor-General approve of the statement I made to the Rawat, but that, in the circumstances, it may be put on record that Salumbar has had every opportunity of adducing all his evidence, and that there will be a very strong *a priori* suspicion of the genuineness of any document that may be produced in future.

8. But, for the reasons which will now appear, I do not anticipate that the Rawat's claim that the Maharana should come to Salumbar for the *Matampuri* ceremony will again be revived. It will be observed that, in enclosure A, I advised the Rawat to tender absolute submission and ask pardon for his past contumacy. He represented that to admit, *totidem verbis*, that he had been guilty of any specific offence against the Darbar would be fatal to him and the *Thikana*. There is much force in this, since the views obtaining in Rajputana on ethical questions of this kind differ somewhat from Western ideas. I accordingly waived the insertion of specific words of confession, provided he would definitively and finally waive his and his *Jagir*'s claim to be *Matampuri'd* by His Highness, and provided he would insert words which, though they did not recite any specific offences, requested pardon and indicated regret. After a long discussion, the result was the letter to His Highness of which I attach a translation (marked "C") and which I brought back with me to Jaigarh and presented to His Highness, who expresses himself entirely satisfied and states that he will take an early\* opportunity of sending the Maharaj Kunwar to Salumbar.

9. The results, then of my proceedings are:—

- (a) the abandonment, formally, by Salumbar of his pretensions to be *Matampuri'd* at Salumbar by His Highness;
- (b) the acceptance (*vide* section V, paragraphs 7 and 8) by His Highness of the suggestion that the other nobles shall be notified of the results of the enquiry;
- (c) His Highness' agreement to consult me as to any action that may be taken in dealing with Salumbar, and
- (d) His Highness' promise to send the Maharaj Kunwar to Salumbar.

[Incidentally, I may mention that the Rawatji offered to sign at once the *quolnama* agreed to by the other Sardars on the subject of judicial administration but which Kesri Singh refused to sign in 1873 (*vide* paragraphs 1 (3) and 6 of section II of the memoranda).]

10. On the question whether the results thus achieved will materially and permanently ameliorate the relations between His Highness and Salumbar it is too early yet to pronounce an opinion. There were circumstances connected with the appointment of Rawat Unar Singh to Salumbar which render his subsequent conduct peculiarly exasperating; and, unless the Rawat really acts upon the advice I gave him, and abandons his attitude of irreconcileable resistance to all requests from the Darbar, I have not much hope of improvement. It is most unfortunately the case that the present Rawat is unstable as water. He can do nothing without consulting the M<sup>ji</sup>, and is surrounded by people whose direct interest it is to perpetuate the traditional quarrel between the Darbar and Chandaji's representative. On the 14th December, I insisted on his deciding matters for himself and would allow the attendance of

---

\* Note—Early in Mewar has a somewhat protracted meaning.

no one; but I have little doubt that, on my departure, he has submitted to the reproaches of his people for not taking their advice, and that he would, if it were possible, revoke all he has said and done. It is, indeed, quite possible that it may hereafter be represented that the Rawatji signed the paper (enclosure C) under compulsion. He endeavoured to pave the way for a colourable presentment of the proceedings in this light by saying he would do anything if I gave the *Hukm* and by enquiring whether it was my *Hukm* that he should write the letter. I said it was no question of an order; that I had come over to Salumbar solely out of consideration for the interest of the *Thitana*, and that, if he rejected the advice I had given him, I should go away with regret, but that I certainly would give no orders as to his acceptance of it. If he rejected it I shall leave without the letter, and His Highness would probably feel that no conciliatory measures would be of smallest use. Moreover, as I pointed out, it made no practical difference to the merits of the case whether he signed the renunciation of his claims to the *Matampursi* or not, since the decision disposed of that in any case. I trouble Mr. Colvin, with regret, with these particulars, because they, in my opinion, indicate that there is but slender hope that so weak a character will ever be able to withstand the evil influences which, for 7 years past, have effaced all the individuality Rawat Unar Singh may once have possessed. His health is bad and he has no son; and his surroundings, and the conditions of the past 7 years have all tended to undermine the mental strength of a character naturally amiable but hopelessly weak.

11. In conclusion, and with reference to the course adopted in this particular case, I desire to point out, with some emphasis, that we had no *locus standi* in this dispute; that Salumbar had no business to represent his case as he did, and that it concerned a matter of internal interest with which it was no business of mine to interfere. I mention the matter because (a) I do not consider that this case should form a precedent for more or less formal proceedings and reports in future disputes of an analogous kind, and (b) the Darbar, in consenting to enter upon the whole question and placing at my disposal all their papers in the case, would greatly regret their complaisance in the matter if they thought that it would be cited as a precedent. So much do I regard His Highness' action as exceptional that I would ask the Hon'ble the Agent to the Governor-General, if he concurs in the above view, to authorize me to express to the Maharana his acknowledgments for the manner in which he has permitted access to his papers and for his courtesy and firm-mindedness throughout the enquiry. Moreover, if Mr. Colvin will add an expression of his appreciation of His Highness' readiness so promptly to send the Maharaj Kunwar to Salumbar, I have no doubt that that appreciation will be greatly valued and will tend to the healing of this deplorable quarrel.

#### List of Enclosures.—

- (1) Appendices A. B. and C.
- (2) Memoranda of enquiry.—

#### I. *Matampursi*.

#### II. Interference by Darbar in administration of justice.

#### III. Run.

#### IV. Minor complaints.

#### V. Conclusions.

- (3) Exhibits A. to S.

#### APPENDIX A.

I have now examined carefully all the evidence which you gave me about the *Matampursi*. The chief documents upon which you rely are:—

- (1) *Parwana* from Maharana Kumbhaji to Rawat Kandalji on which the date written is Maha Sudi 5, Sambat 1483.
- (2) *Parwana* from Amar Singh II, son of Jai Singh, dated Sambat 1765.
- (3) *Rubkar* from Colonel Lawrence of 1855 A. D., who assumed it was the usual practice for the Maharana to go to Salumbar.

## Serial No. 1 ] Grievances of the Rawat of Salumbar against Mewar.

(4) Rawat Kesri Singh's letter in which the words occur "we pray Eklingji to give you a son and that he should come" and "ancient custom should be observed."

As to the Parwana to Kandalji, I have found out that it cannot be genuine. Kumbhaji did not become Rana till Sambat 1490. This is proved by a stone inscription at Eklingji showing that Mokalji still lived in 1485 and by an inscription at Chitor which I have read which also shows Mokalji lived two or three years after the date on the Parwana. The *perinoma* which you yourself put in also shows that Mokalji died in 1490. Further, even if it was not false, it shows nothing about the *Matampursi*.

As to Amar Singh's *Parwana*. This is dated 1765. It says that "afterwards Rawat Kandalji died in Sambat 1752. On this occasion according to old rights and privileges of Salumbar the Maharanee visited Salumbar and taking the Rawat with him to Udaipur performed the ceremony of *Tulwar-bandhan*."

According to well-known history, borne out by records supplied by Salumbar in past days and supported by Bedla history Rawat Ragunath Singh was banished from Salumbar by Rana Raj Singh for rebellion, and went to Delhi, and neither his son Rattan Singh nor his successor Kandalji were ever at Salumbar. Rattan Singh was given the *Jagir* of Chavand, but Salumbar remained with the Chohan Raoji of Parsoli. Rattan Singh's son, Kandalji, was told he could have Salumbar if he killed Kesri Singh of Parsoli who had rebelled. He did so, but was himself killed also. Kandalji's son Kesri Singh succeeded to Salumbar.

Therefore the *Parwana* which recites untrue facts cannot be relied upon and must be regarded as a forgery.

As to Colonel Lawrence's *Rubkar* it states that it is the practice to go to Salumbar for the *Matampursi*. Colonel Lawrence clearly was judging on the evidence then available and had not made enquiry into history. If he had, he would have found that the evidence was false.

As to Rawat Kesri Singh's letter, I can find no reason to assume it means anything but what it actually says.

In these circumstances, after much consideration, I have decided that there is no trustworthy evidence that Salumbar has any right based on old custom.

On two occasions, it is true, the Rana has actually performed the *Matampursi* ceremony at Salumbar—once in Bhim Singh's time, and once in Shimbhu Singh's time. Both these were special occasions. Bhim Singh did it at the special request of the Maji and Shimbhu Singh was taken to Salumbar by the Nobles, in whose power he then was. Neither of these is a precedent which establishes a right.

You will therefore, in future, receive no support in your claim to be *Matampursid* at Salumbar, and I may mention that it will be no use appealing to the Hon'ble the Agent to the Governor-General since I have shown him all the papers and evidence and he is convinced that your evidence is untrustworthy. You are perhaps not to blame, but either your ancestors or advisers are to blame for having forged false document.

As to interference by the Darbar in your administration of justice. You rely on—

(1) Parwana, dated Mangsar Sudi 1st, Sambat 1755, from Amar Singh which reads:—

"You are ordered to punish the criminals in the Jagirdars, Nobles, and Khalsa villages in the Chapan Pargana. If any one complains the Darbar will not attend to the complaint."

(2) Parwana of Kumbhaji of Sambat 1483, which is a forgery.

(3) Kesri Singh's refusal, in Sambat 1936, to enter into the agreement, with the other Nobles, about civil and criminal powers.

As to the Parwana of 1755. Even if it is genuine it only gives directions and authority to Kesri Singh not to his successors. I have seen many similar documents given to other people, and none of them have been taken to give a right in perpetuity.

As to Kesri Singh's refusal. The facts are that Rana Sajjan Singh wrote an identical letter to all Sardars to invite them to consider the judicial rules in Committee. Kesri Singh refused to serve alleging he had full powers. Most of the other Nobles served on the Committee and agreed to the rules—but not all. The Meja Raoji and some others refused.

Does this mean that the Meja Raoji too can claim the same independence—though, for example, the Bedla Raoji, who is much bigger, cannot? This is absurd.

But even if the Darbar had given Chandaji full powers, and even if Chandaji's successors had not forfeited those powers by rebellion, the British Government, which holds the Darbar responsible for the administration of justice, would not allow such complete independence as is claimed by Salumbar. When the Resident hears of bad government in a *jagir* he asks the Darbar for report and the Darbar must have power to supervise.

In those *Jagirs*, whose Raojis were wise, an agreement was made. There there is less trouble and the Darbar has to interfere less. It was foolish to refuse to enter the agreement.

As to the Run, as I said before, I am not going to enquire in detail; but your claim to the whole Run is absurd. You know now that the *Parwana* giving you the whole Run is a forgery; and before I found that it was false I thought it must be because it was impossible that the whole Run could be yours since Koabar and Khalsa villages also surround the Dhebar lake. The demarcation of your villages and rights is for the Boundary Settlement Officer. All I can declare is that you are not entitled to the whole.

I am sorry thus to have to find that your claims are based on forgeries and have no validity. But that is the fact. I have told the Darbar that that is my opinion.

It remains for me to give you advice. It is to make speedy submission to the Darbar. You should express regret that, owing to the mistake of your ancestors you have advanced wrong claims which you now withdraw. If you do this I will endeavour to help you to secure the favour of the Darbar, and all minor troubles will easily be settled.

If you will agree now to address a *Khat* to the Darbar I will take it with me and endeavour to get His Highness to forgive you speedily.

This is good advice and is in the interests of your *izzat*. You perhaps did not know that your claims were based on false papers. Therefore it was no dishonour to press your claims. Now you do know that your *Parwanas* are false. If you press your claims now it will be derogatory to your *izzat*. And you will receive no sympathy or help from the British Government.

Finally I must remind you that, in Rana Sarup Singh's time similar claims were advanced on the strength of alleged *Parwanas* from Rana Mokalji. The Darbar proved those *Parwanas* to be forgeries and the claim now made is based on other forgeries. I strongly advise you to make no further reliance on *Parwanas* of this kind.

#### APPENDIX B.

Salumbar's claim as stated in the reign of Maharana Sarup Singhji.	I. Darbar's reply at the time, and	II. Comments now added by His Highness.
<i>Sanad No. 1 bearing 6 Seals.</i> —The Salumbar authorities produced a <i>Tamba Patra</i> , dated Sawan Sudi 7th, Sambat 1427, purporting to have been granted by Maharana Lakhaji.	Maharana Lakhaji was installed in Sambat 1439. How can the <i>Tumba Patra</i> be dated Sambat 1427 or 12 years earlier?	It is clear from page 305, Volume I, of the History that Maharana Lakhaji succeeded to the throne in Sambat 1439. When the Maharana did not rule in Sambat 1427, how can the <i>Tamba Patra</i> , purporting to have been granted by him in Sambat 1427 be considered genuine? The difference is of 12 years.
At the bottom of the <i>Tamba Patra</i> , dated Sambat 1427, the following is recorded and is signed by Kunwar Mokulji in Sambat 1437 at the age of 9 years. "This <i>Tamba Patra</i> was granted by Daji Raj Bhaiji Shri Chundaji in Sambat 1427. It is confirmed by order* signed by Bhai Mokalji in presence of Shri Daji Raj. My age is 9 years. Sambat 1437. The above is correct."	(1) Mokulji is represented to have written that this <i>Tumba Patra</i> was granted by Daji Raj (Maharana Lakhaji) in Sambat 1427. History shows that Maharana Lakhaji succeeded to the throne in Sambat 1439. How can the above sentence of the <i>Tamba Patra</i> be considered genuine, as Maharana Kshetra Singhji ruled in Sambat 1427?	

## Serial No. 1] Grievances of the Rawat of Salumbar against Mewar.

Salumbar's claim as stated in the reign of Maharana Sarup Singhji.	I. Darbar's reply at the time, and	II. Comments now added by His Highness.
<p>There are six seals at the top of the <i>Tamba Patra</i> of Sambat 1427, one contains the following words "Maharana Sri Partab Singhji, Sambat 1624."</p> <p>The <i>Tamba Patra</i> of Sambat 1427 contains the signature of Pancholi Behari Dass.</p> <p><i>Sanad No. 2.</i>—Maharana Mokulji's <i>Parwana</i>, dated Pos Sudi 9th, Sambat 1443, to the address of Chandaji calling him from Mandu.</p> <p><i>Sanad No. 3.</i>—Maharana Mokulji's <i>Parwana</i> dated Phagan Sudi 13th, Sambat 1444, to the address of Chandaji asking him not to go to Mandu and to remain here.</p> <p><i>Sanad No. 4.</i>—Maharana Mokulji's <i>Parwana</i>, dated Asoj Sudi 13th, Sambat 1447, to the address of Chandaji regarding ceremonies and customs connected with Matampuri.</p>	<p>(2) Mokulji is represented to have given his age as 9 years at the time but history shows that Mokulji was from a wife whom Maharana Lakhaji married after his succession to the throne. Supposing Maharana Lakhaji was married in Sambat 1439, the year he came to the throne, and a son was born to him the same year, he could be 9 years of age only in Sambat 1449 and not in Sambat 1437. This shows a difference of 12 years. In the circumstances, how can the sentence alleged to have been written by him be considered genuine? The difference will be still greater if Maharana Lakhaji married many years after Sambat 1439. According to the <i>Tamba Patra</i>, which is dated Sambat 1427, the difference is 12 years and according to the date of the signature, viz., Sambat 1437, the difference is 12 years more. The total difference thus amounts to 24 years.</p> <p>The <i>Tamba Patra</i> purports to have been granted by Maharana Lakhaji and bears the seal of Maharana Partab Singhji of Sambat 1624. But Maharana Partab Singhji succeeded to the throne in Sambat 1628, then how can the seal be dated Sambat 1624. Partab Singhji existed 9 generations after Lakhaji.</p> <p>Maharana Mokulji succeeded to the throne in Sambat 1454. How could the <i>parwana</i> have been written in Sambat 1443 or 11 years earlier?</p> <p>Maharana Mokulji succeeded to the gaddi in Sambat 1454. How could he possibly have written the <i>Parwana</i> in Sambat 1444 or 10 years earlier?</p> <p>Maharana Mokulji ascended the gaddi in Sambat 1454. How could he have written the <i>Parwana</i> in Sambat 1447?</p>	<p>Page 145 of Vol. II of the History shows that Maharana Partab Singhji ascended the throne in Sambat 1628 and that Maharana Udai Singhji ruled in Sambat 1624. In these circumstances, how can Maharana Partab Singhji's seal dated Sambat 1624, be considered genuine? Besides this Maharana Partab Singhji ruled 9 generations, i.e., 169 years after Lakhaji.</p> <p>Pages 9, 974 and 977 of Vol. III of the History shows that Pancholi Behari Dassji existed during the rule of Maharana Sagram Singhji who ascended the throne in Sambat 1767 and died in Sambat 1790. How can Behari Dassji be supposed to have signed a document 340 years before his existence, and how can the signature represented to be his own, be considered genuine?</p> <p>From Page 310 of Vol. I of the History, it is clear that Maharana Mokulji succeeded to the gaddi in Sambat 1454. The <i>Parwana</i>, dated Sambat 1443 purporting to have been written by Maharana Mokulji cannot therefore be considered genuine. There is a difference of 11 years.</p> <p>Page 310 of Vol. I of the History shows that Maharana Mokulji succeeded to the gaddi in Sambat 1454. The <i>Parwana</i>, dated Sambat 1444, is therefore entirely false.</p> <p>Page 310 of Vol. I of the History shows that Maharana Mokulji ascended the gaddi in Sambat 1454. How can the <i>Parwana</i>, dated Sambat 1447, purporting to have been granted by Maharana Mokulji be considered genuine? There is a difference of 7 years.</p>

**Grievances of the Bawat of Salumbar against Mewar. [Serial No. 1**

Salumbar's claim as stated in the reign of Maharana Sawai Singhji.	I. Darbar's reply at the time, and	II. Comments now added by His Highness.
<p><i>Sanad No. 5.—Maharana Vikramaditya's Parwana, dated Chait Budi 7th, Sambat 1572, to the address of Rawat Khangarji regarding his inability to pay a condolence visit owing to illness.</i></p> <p>The Parwana mentions that Sain Dasji and his son were slain at Chitor.</p>	<p>Vikramadityaji ascended the gaddi in Sambat 1591 while the Parwana is dated Sambat 1572. How could he have written the Parwana 18 or 19 years earlier? Rawat Khangarji did not exist in Sambat 1572. Rawat Sain Dasji and his son were slain in Sambat 1624 when Chitor was conquered in Maharana Udai Singhji's time. How does the Parwana mention that they were slain in Sambat 1572 or 52 years earlier?</p>	<p>Maharana Vikramadityaji ascended the gaddi in Sambat 1588, <i>vide</i> page 25 of Vol I of the History. Todd's Rajasthan shows that the Maharana succeeded to the gaddi in Sambat 1591. How could the Parwana have been written by Maharana Vikramadityaji in Sambat 1572, as Maharana Sagram Singhji and not Maharana Vikramadityaji ruled in Sambat 1572?</p>
	<p>This Parwana, dated Sambat 1572, mentions that Rawat Sain Dasji and his son were slain at Chitor, but page 82 of Vol I of the History shows that Rawat Sain Dasji was slain in Sambat 1624 when Akbar invaded Chitor. How does the Parwana mention that Sain Dasji was slain in Sambat 1572 or 52 years earlier?</p>	<p>Sain Dasji was slain in the time of Maharana Udai Singhji and Vikramadityaji ruled prior to Udai Singhji. How could Vikramadityaji have mentioned this fact in his Parwana, as the incident relates to Maharana Udai Singhji's time? Further the genealogical table lately submitted by Salumbar to the Resident shows that Sain Dasji was contemporary with Maharana Udai Singhji. The Parwana dated Sambat 1572 previously submitted by Salumbar shows that Sain Dasji was slain prior to Sambat 1572. Which of the statements made by Salumbar can be considered to be correct?</p> <p>Rawat Khagaji was contemporary with Maharana Udai Singhji which fact is stated in the list lately submitted by Salumbar to the Resident, while Maharana Vikramaditya's Parwana, dated Sambat 1572, previously submitted by Salumbar purports to have been addressed to Khangarji. Which of the statements made by Salumbar should be considered as correct?</p>

**APPENDIX C.**

*Translation of a communication from Rawat Unar Singh of Salumbar to His Highness the Maharana of Udaipur, dated Mangsar Sudi 10th, Sambat 1964 (14th December 1907).*

Your Highness' order is that it is the custom for the Maharaj Kunwar to go to Salumbar for the *Matampursi*. I therefore beg to request that Your Highness will be pleased to kindly send the Maharaj Kunwar to Salumbar at an early date. I am quite confident of Your Highness' favour. Your Highness is my lord. I beg Your Highness' pardon for what has occurred and for unfortunately remaining away from you.

Serial No. 1] Grievances of the Rawat of Salumbar against Mewar.

(Enclosures to Appendix A.)

EXHIBITS IN SALUMBAR'S CASE.

*A.—Translation of a Parwana from Maharana Kumbhaji to Bhai Kundalji, dated Maha Sudi 6th, Sambat 1483.*

On the demise of Kakkaji Chandaji, you are granted the title of Rawat, Matampur, Siropan to you and your zenana and the following pargana with great dignity:—

The pargana of Sirohi.  
Nalodai village in the pargana of Godwal.  
Begun.  
Bicher.  
You already possess Kotharia  
You can establish your capital wherever you please.

The Siropan will consist of:—

2 Siropanos.  
Kanthi, set with pearls.  
Diamond Sir-pech.  
2 Diamond wristlets.  
Pearl ear-rings.  
Hookar plumes.  
Sword, set with jewels.  
Shield.  
Yak tails.  
Elephants—one for conveying your standard and one with Howdah.  
4 horses—two with gold and silver-mounted trappings and two others.  
4 gold and silver-mounted maces.  
1 Kettle drum.

You were sent to your haveli mounted on an elephant with all my followers and insignias and Yak tail bearers. This dignity has been granted to you and your heirs in perpetuity. In this State there is no one over you. You are the pillar of the State.

Written as dictated by the Maharana.

*B.—Translation of a Parwana, dated Mangsar Sudi, 2nd, Sambat 1765, granted by Maharana Amar Singhji to Rawat Kesri Singhji of Salumbar.*

When the late Maharana was going to construct the Jaisagar Lake, Rawat Kundalji represented that Salumbar and other villages were acquired by his ancestors at the sacrifice of their lives, that when he was installed he was granted a *putta* of assurance in Sambat 1739, and that it was not proper to act contrary to the *putta* which His Highness would do if the villages of his *putta* would be submerged by the Lake. Maharana Jai Singh thereupon granted the alluvial of the Lake to Salumbar in return for all the villages of that *putta* submerged by the Lake, and after the construction of the dam the State share of the produce of the alluvial accordingly continued to be taken by Rawat Kandalji up to Sambat 1751.

Afterwards, the Rawat died in Sambat 1752. On this occasion, according to the old custom of the estate, Maharana Jai Singh visited Salumbar and brought you with him to Udaipur and performed the ceremony of *Talwar-bandhi*.

The produce of the alluvial was taken by the State that year and on your making a representation in the matter an order was issued, but no *parwana* was granted. Owing to no *parwana* having been granted to you the State share of the produce of the alluvial has again been demanded by the State and you have therefore again submitted a representation on the subject. On this account, this *parwana* is granted to you. No *Dhons* will be sent or any demand made from you in connection with the alluvial or your village.

## Grievances of the Rawat of Salumbar against Mewar. [Serial No. 1]

C—List of Rawats of Salumbar who received visits of condolence from the Mahiranas from the time of Rawat Kundalji.

Serial number.	Name of the Rawat.	Name of the place where His Highness went for condolence ceremony.	Name of His Highness who went for condolence ceremony.	Name of the place where the Talwar-bandhi ceremony was performed.	REMARKS.
1	Rawat Kundalji, son of Chandaaji.	Bhainsror.	Maharana Sri Kumbkaranji	Kumalgarh	
2	„ Sain Dasji	Do.	„ „ Udai Singhji	Chitor.	
3	„ Khangar Dasji	Begun.	„ „ Udai Singhji	Begun.	
4	„ Ratan Singhji	Bhainsror	„ „ Sagram Singhji	Bhainsror.	
5	„ Kishan Dasji	Begun.	„ „ Partab Singhji	Begun.	
6	„ Jet Singhji	Salumbar.	„ „ Amar Singhji	Udaipur.	
7	„ Man Singhji	Do.	„ „ Amar Singhji	Do.	
8	Rawat Pirthi Singhji	Salumbar.	Maharana Sri Jagat Singhji	Udaipur.	
9	„ Rughnath Singhji	Do.	„ „ Raj Singhji	Do.	
10	„ Ratan Singhji	...	.....	...	Died within 4 years.
11	„ Kandalji	Salumbar.	„ „ Raj Singhji	Udaipur.	
12	„ Kesri Singhji	Do.	„ „ Jey Singhji	Do.	
13	„ Kuvar Singhji	Do.	„ „ Jagat Singhji	Do.	
14	„ Tej Singhji	Do.	„ „ Jagat Singhji	Do.	
15	„ Jodh Singhji	Do.	„ „ Raj Singhji	Do.	
16	„ Pahar Singhji	Nahar Magra.	„ „ Ari Singhji	Do.	
17	„ Bhim Singhji	Salumbar.	„ „ Ari Singhji	Do.	
18	„ Bhawani Singhji	Do.	„ „ Bhim Singhji	Do.	
19	„ Padam Singhji	Do.	„ „ Bhim Singhji	Do.	
20	„ Kesri Singhji	...	.....	...	His Highness did not come owing to Salumbar's protest against the Qoulnama.
21	„ Jodh Singhji	Salumbar.	„ „ Shimbhu Singhji	Udaipur.	
22	„ Unar Singhji	...	.....	...	Now under dispute.

Before the foundation of Udaipur the Rawats from Chanda to Kishen Dassji, Nos. 1 to 5, had their head-quarters at Bhainsror and Begun, hence the condolence ceremonies took place at Bhainsror and Begun and the Talwar-bandhi ceremony at Kumalgarh, Bhainsror, Chitor and Begun, respectively. From the time of Rawat Kishen Dassji, we were called Kishnawats and it is he who took possession of Salumbar by the sword from Sing Salumbar, whose Chabutra is up to this time at Salumbar near Suraj Pol.

Since that time the condolence ceremony is being performed at Salumbar and the Talwar-bandhi ceremony at Udaipur.

---

 Serial No. 1] Grievances of the Rawat of Salumbar against Mewar.
 

---

D.—*Translation of a communication, dated Mugh Sudi 2nd, Sambat 1906, from Rawat Kesri Singh of Salumbar to Maharana Sarup Singh of Udaipur.*

You are my superior and my Lord. If you look upon me with favour, then only I can maintain myself. You told Captain Brooke and he communicated the order to me here. I bear your orders on my head. You will maintain the custom which you have established as you are my master. I do not regard anything in the world superior to you. I have committed no fault. But inferiors are always at fault. They commit four faults at every step. You will, therefore, not regard my short-comings but consider your greatness and regard me with good will. You have written about sending Sri Kunwarji. My repeated prayer to Eklingji is that you may be blest with a son and that he may come to call (me). You have been pleased to give this order. As you have made this *Pal* (meaning probably custom) you will be pleased to maintain it. You are great, my god and like Eklingji. This is my prayer.

---

E.—*Extract from Kharita, dated 4th July 1855, from Maharana Sarup Singh of Udaipur to Lieutenant-Colonel G. St. P. Lawrence, Political Agent, Mewar.*

You write to me that both the Agent to the Governor-General and yourself advised me, when at Udaipur, that I should go to Salumbar to perform the ceremony of investiture, in order that the Chief of that place may have no room to complain. I spoke to you on this subject as well as submitted for your inspection a *bahi* (or ledger) showing that it was usual for the heir-apparent to go to Salumbar; that this was acknowledged by Rawat Padam Singh and was also contained in the paper presented by Rawat Kesri Singh to Captain Brooke, on which you said that as I had no Kunwar, I should go myself, that if this was not done, the Salumbar Chief will not come to Udaipur. I replied that I was well acquainted with his ways and manners; that his coming to Udaipur would only be productive of evil. You then said that I should do as I pleased. You now wish me to go to Salumbar; the fact is, on Colonel Low's telling me that all disputes would cease if I went to Salumbar, I said I had no objection to do so but that I was apprehensive the Salumbar Chief on coming here might wish to act as a Bhanjgurria (or councillor), and disobey my orders, on which I was assured that this would never be the case. I then spoke to you that if the Salumbar man gave a hand-writing to the effect that he would not meddle in State affairs, I would proceed at once to Salumbar. The Sahib tried his best to persuade Kesri Singh to give a writing, but he would not listen, and returned to his estate. Under these circumstances, my going to Salumbar was dropped.

---

F.—*Note on the Bijolia case.*

The *Talwar-bandhai* case with Bijolia on which there was considerable correspondence through the Resident's office, has been finally settled in favour of the Darbar's claim.

Since then there has been a further dispute between the Darbar and the Rao of Bijolia on the subject of *Loazima* or insignia. It appears that in Sambat 1855 when the Rao came to the Dasehra he carried in the processions certain insignia which the Darbar considered were unauthorized, *viz.*, Meghadambar, an Adani and gold (instead of silver) Chobs or Chbarris. He was remonstrated with in writing, but sent no explanation except that it had always been the custom for the Rao of Bijolia to carry these insignia, and at the same time he returned the Darbar's letter in original, as he objected to certain expressions used such as "Hazir Hcwe," etc. In the course of the correspondence which then took place the Darbar quotes the list of honours belonging to Bijolia described in a *Bahi* or record drawn up originally in Maharana Bhim Singh's (Tod's) time—called the *Putta Bahi*. This document contains a list of all the first class Sardars of Mewar and describes in each case in detail the extent of their *jagir*, the honours to which each is entitled and the various Sanads which each has obtained from former Chiefs, and in each case the description is signed by the Kamdarwan and Faqdarwan of the *Thikana*. Unfortunately the original *Putta Bahi* drawn up at the time with the original signatures is now forthcoming and that now quoted by the Darbar is a copy only. But it bears every indication of being a true and authentic copy.

**Grievances of the Rawat of Salumbar against Mewar. [Serial No. 1]**

Bijolia, however, objected to its authenticity or at any rate to its applicability in his case, on the ground that in his *Talwar-bandhai* case, this document was not accepted by the Darbar as an authority, and therefore, should not be taken as such in the present instance. Here the matter has rested until the late Dasehra, when the Raoji has again come to Udaipur though too late to join in any of the regular Desehra processions.

On the Rao's arrival at Udaipur His Highness placed the whole case before me and asked me to interview the Rao and find out whether he was now willing to obey the Darbar's orders and if not to advise the Maharana as to the action he should take in the matter, I interviewed the Rao on the subject yesterday with the following result; I pointed out to him :—

- (1) That whatever may be the rights of the case it was most disrespectful on his part to return the Darbar's letter in original as he had done.
- (2) That as regards the insignia question I was satisfied from the evidence set before me by the Darbar that in many instances the Sardars had been gradually, ever since Maharana Sarup Singh's time, assuming insignia over and above those to which they were entitled and that, in order to stop such irregularities in future, His Highness had been obliged to make careful enquiries into the subject. The most important document dealing with it was the well-known *Putta Bhai* which contains lists of the emblems to which each Jagirdar had been entitled up to Bhim Singh's time and it appeared to me that the Darbar was perfectly justified in enquiring by what right or on the strength of what Sanad or Khas Rukka any jagirdar carried emblems not mentioned in the *Putta Bhai*. The emblems to which Bijolia is entitled by the *Putta Bhai* are two silver Chharris, two Masals, 1 Nagara, 1 Nishan, and 1 Palki. Besides these every jagirdar can carry a Jarap, Dhupkeri, Chawa and Banduks. But these latter are not specially mentioned as they are well-known to be the custom, and are considered of small account, whereas the Maghadumbar, Adani and gold Chhari are important insignia of Royalty and cannot be carried by any one except the Chief in his own possession unless he possesses a special Sanad to this effect.
- (3) As regards *Talwar-bandhai* not having been mentioned in the *Putta Bhai* I pointed out that *Talwar-bandhai* Nazarana was due from every jagirdar on succession according to Rajput custom and that ordinarily speaking there would be no mention of it in a document of this kind except in the case of those few Jagirdars who were specially excused. In his case there was no mention of it because he was not excused.

Somewhat to my surprise the Rao was most amenable, and said that he had no wish to carry the dispute any further, that he apologised for having returned the Darbar's letter and wished to be pardoned for that and any offensive letters that may have been written in his name by a former Kamdar, who had been dismissed 2 years ago, that if the Darbar would send him a list of the insignia which he might carry with him in processions he would only use these in future or, if, His Highness preferred it he would lay all his insignia at Sri Huzur's feet and take back any that His Highness might be pleased to confer on him with a fresh Sanad; and that in Maharat-ka-Shikar on the 6th November he had purposely taken no insignia at all, as he did not wish to displease the Darbar.

He then went on to explain that the reasons why he had resisted the Darbar's orders in the first instance were that—

- (1) He and the other Jagirdars concerned has distrusted the authenticity of the *Putta Bhai* as the original document had never been shown to them.
- (2) Although he had no Sanad for the 3 emblems to which the Darbar objected he knew that his father had carried them and was led to understand that they had always been in his family.
- (3) His position amongst Mewar Jagirdars was peculiar because his ancestor, who was a Puar Rajput and not a member of the Maharana's family, had come to Mewar originally at the instance of the Mewar Chief as Rao in his own

## Serial No. 1] Grievances of the Rawat of Salumbar against Mewar.

right and that this title had not been conferred on him by the Mewar Darbar, and that, therefore, he could not produce Sanads either for his title, or of Rao or for any of the other privileges which had descended to him from the original title-holder. His title of a "Sawai" had been conferred on him by a former Maharana and for that he had a Sanad.

(4) Even if the *Patta Bahi* were authentic he understood that it contained only such honours as had been conferred by Chiefs of Mewar, and did not mention those which were inherent in his family before he became a Mewar feudatory.

However, he now realized that it was no use to fight these questions any further, and that he was prepared to obey any orders which it might please the Darbar to issue in his case. In these circumstances I would advise His Highness to pardon any indiscretions committed by the Raoji while he was still under the influence of evil counsellors, whom he has now completely discarded, to issue distinct instructions as to the emblems to which he considers the Rao entitled and I would further recommend that, in view of the complete submission now made by the Rao and of his evident desire to accept the Darbar's authority, it would be good policy if His Highness were to confer on him some special mark of favour such as the privilege of adding an "Adani" or a gold stick to his insignia. This would, I feel sure, do more to strengthen his loyalty to the Darbar and to reduce other Jagirdars to submission than any repressive measures.

(Sd.) A. F. PINHEY, MAJOR,

Resident, Mewar.

Dated Udaipur, 9th November 1903.

G.—Translation of an extract from the *Patta Bahi*.

From—Foujdars and Kamdars of Rawat Padam Singhji.

If there should be any discrepancy in the reply that we have had written above we may be held guilty by the Darbar.

BHAT FATTEHRAM.

H.—List of Maharanas from Rana Lakha to the present Maharanas.

Serial No.	Name of the Maharanas.	Sambat year in which born.	Sambat year in which succeeded to the Gadi.	Sambat year upto which reigned.	REMARKS.
1	Nabarana Shri Lakhaji . . . . .	... . . . .	1439	1454	
2	" " Mokalji . . . . .	... . . . .	1454	1490	
3	" " Kumbkaranje . . . . .	... . . . .	1490	1525	
4	" " Udai Singhji . . . . .	... . . . .	1525	...	
5	" " Raj Malji . . . . .	... . . . .	1530	1565	
6	" " Sagram Singhji I . . . . .	1538	1565	1584	
7	" " Ratan Singhji . . . . .	... . . . .	1584	1588	
8	" " Vikramaditji . . . . .	1574	1588	1592	
9	" " Udai Singhji . . . . .	1583	1594	1628	
10	" " Partab Singhji I . . . . .	1596	1628	1653	
11	" " Amar Singhji I . . . . .	1616	1653	1676	
12	" " Karen Singhji . . . . .	1640	1676	1684	

## Grievances of the Rawat of Salumbar against Mewār. [Serial No. 1]

Serial No.	Name of the Maharana.	Sambat Year in which born.	Sambat year in which succeeded to the Gadi.	Sambat Year up to which reigned.	REMARKS.
13	Muhaiana Shri Jagat Singhji I . . .	1664	1684	1709	
14	" " Raj Singhji . . .	1686	1709	1737	
15	" " Jey Singhji . . .	1710	1737	1755	Constructed Jaismand lake.
16	" " Amar Singhji II . . .	1729	1755	1767	The Parwana granted by him is annexed.
17	" " Sagram Singhji II . . .	1747	1767	1790	
18	" " Jagat Singhji II . . .	1766	1790	1808	
19	" " Partab Singhji II . . .	1781	1808	1810	
20	" " Raj Singhji II . . .	1800	1810	1817	
21	" " Ari Singhji . . .	...	1817	1829	
22	" " Hamir Singhji . . .	1818	1829	1834	
23	" " Bhim Singhji . . .	1824	1834	1835	
24	" " Jawan Singhji . . .	1857	1885	1895	
25	" " Sardar Singhji . . .	1855	1895	1899	
26	" " Sarup Singhji . . .	1871	1899	1913	
27	" " Shimbu Singhji . . .	1904	1918	1931	
28	" " Sajjan Singhji . . .	1916	1931	1941	
29	" " Fateh Singhji . . .	1906	1941	...	

J.—*Translation of a communication, dated Magh Budi 6, Sambat 1907, from Maharana Sarup Singhji to Rawat Sobhag Singhji.*

It has just come to our knowledge that the Bhils of the Pals surrounding the village of Bhabrana belonging to Rawat Hamir Singh, are giving trouble. You should, therefore, with your *jamiat* go personally to Bhabrana and take measures in case the Bhils of Manpura cause trouble and commit raid.

[By order]  
PANCHOLI HAR NATH.

K.—*Translation of a communication, dated Asoj Budi 11, Sambat 1907, from Maharana Sarup Singhji to Rawat Sobhag Singhji.*

(Your) petition was received and its contents brought to my knowledge. You did well in meeting the Bhils of the Pals of Sarara who had revolted and committed a raid on the Sarara Cantonment. You applied for assistance. This is being sent and it will reach you. You wrote about coming here by Teras (13th day of the month). You need not come here but you should remain there. This is my order. Should more assistance be required you may write so and more assistance will be sent according to your request.

L.—*Translation of a communication, dated Katik Budi 3, Sambat 1906, from Maharana Sarup Singhji to Rawat Sobhag Singhji.*

Prohit Rewadutt has been sent from here to punish the Pal. You should therefore join him when required with all your *jamiat* and punish (the villagers). Let there be no delay in this.

## Serial No. 1] Grievances of the Rawat of Salumbar against Mewar.

*M.—Translation of a communication, dated Baisakh Budi 3, Sambat 1905, addressed to Rawat Sobhag Singhji.*

There is a feud between Rawat Zorawar Singhji of Semari and the villagers of Pal Sagtari. You should therefore join Sheikh Chand and punish them and bring about peace.

*N.—Translation of a communication, dated Magh Sudi 1, Sambat 1916, from Kothari Kesri Singhji to Ranawat Nawal Singhji of Palsad.*

Jemadar Khwaj Bakhshji has been deputed to maintain order in the Magra and to enquire into the complaints made. You should, therefore, when required by him, join the troops with your *janiyat* and take effective measures to prevent theft, dakaati, etc., in your charge. If necessary, you should also acquaint the Jemadar with the decision (faisla) and furnish him with the defence in cases concerning your estate. If a case be proved you should carry out the decision according to the verbal or written instruction of the Jemadar.

*O.—Literal translation of a letter from Captain Cobbe to Rawat Padam Singh of Salumbar, dated 1st October 1826.*

The *Chataund* to be levied from all the Sardars has been fixed. As regards the *Chataund* to be recovered from you by the Daibar, the Darbar have granted you 6 annas out of the customs collection of the Gingla Chowki—the Darbar have agreed to accept 6 annas out of the *Chataund* to be recovered from you. The revenue of the (desh) estate may increase or decrease, the Darbar will have no claim to recover *Chataund, barar* from you. You will have to render service to the Darbar like other Sardars. The Dhebar Run will remain in your possession as formerly *sada-mad* (Sada=always). There will be no interference in this. There will be no (tar char) change in your villages. Your villages of Chibora, Dewli, Barara and Padla will remain in your possession. No Chitti (meaning dhons) will be sent to your villages from the Kherwara Thana. You will arrange to provide supplies as ordered on payment. Be assured from me.

*P.—*In the first place the dispute about the very boundary between Methuri and Sarari was settled in the Sambat year 1923 in the presence of Amin Jewala Prashad. There is no mention, in the decision, of this parwana being produced at the time. Moreover, if the parwana of the *muasi* grant of the whole of the Run were genuine, as contended by them, how could the Salumbar authorities have allowed the boundaries of the village of Methuri to extend on to the Run.

*Secondly.* The Parwana is unworthy of credit also for the following reason:—

The construction of the Jaisamand lake was commenced in Sambat 1744 during Maharana Jai Singhji's reign and completed in Sambat 1745 in about five years. After this, the Maharana Jey Singh lived up to Sambat 1755, i.e., 11 years and was succeeded by Maharana Amar Singhji. It is stated by Salumbar that the parwana was granted 10 years afterwards in Sambat 1765, i.e., 20 years after the commencement of the construction of the lake. If it was necessary to grant a parwana of the *muasi* of the Run it could have been obtained in Maharana Jai Singhji's time when the construction of the lake was begun, why then would they tacitly have suffered loss for 20 years.

Further, the Jaisamand Run is not only occupied by Salumbar villages but also by Khalsa and Kaler, Bhaderwah and Siyar Jagirdars' villages. In the circumstances how is it possible that a parwana of the *muasi* of the whole Run should have been granted exclusively to Salumbar. The Raj Samand Lake was built one generation before the Jaisamand Lake and the whole of its Run and other rights belong to Khalsa. Similarly, the whole of the Run and other rights of the Udaisagar Lake belong to Khalsa. It is improbable, therefore, that when such practice prevailed elsewhere, *Muasi* of the whole Run of Jaisamand (when the Run of the Lake is not wholly occupied by the village of Salumbar) would be granted to Salumbar. Another reason why the parwana cannot be considered genuine is that the fol-

## Grievances of the Rawat of Salumbar against Mewar. [Serial No. 1]

lowing sentence occurs in the parwana " No dhons or Khalsa will ever be sent to Salumbar. But this has never been observed and on the contrary whenever it is considered necessary' Salumbar is always punished with *Dhons* (Khalsa), etc. In the Parwana which Salumbar alleges deals with the Muafi of the Run ; there are various other irrelevant subjects such as the visit of the Maharana to Salumbar and bringing the Rawat for *Talwar-bandhai*. But in pattas or parwanas granted by the Darbar it is not necessary to write irrelevant matters. Besides this, the words occurring in the parwana *Salumbar padaria so lare lawi ne Udaipur talwar-bandhai* are very much like those used in the dialect and style of writing in Salumbar. The words *Lare lawi ne* are not used in Udaipur. The dialect is one peculiar to Salumbar and is different from the language used in the State pattas and parwanas. Further, the meaning of the parwana is contrary to the old custom of the State as it is not customary for the Darbar to proceed to Salumbar for the *Matampursi*. How then can the parwana be held to be genuine ?

## Q.—List of the villages bordering on the Jaisamand Lake.

1. Gamri	Khalsa.
2. Junijar	Patta Korabar.
3. Navijar	Patta Korabar.
4. Pujori	Patta Korabar.
5. Medura	Patta Bhadesar.
6. Kua	Patta Bhadesar.
7. Thori Chhaparwali	Patta Korabar.
8. Thori Magrawali	Patta Korabar.
9. Semal	Patta Korabar.
10. Methuri	Khalsa.
11. Patan	Patta Salumbar.
12. Paeri	Patta Salumbar.
13. Gingla	Patta Salumbar.
14. Sarari	Patta Salumbar.
15. Kotra	Khalsa.
16. Kotra	Patta Siyar.
17. Singawali	Patta Salumbar.
18. Rathora-ki-Bhagal, hamlet of Makar Sima	Patta Korabar.
19. Makar Sima	Patta Korabar.
20. Badela	Patta Salumbar.
21. Gati	Khalsa.
22. Bhimpura	Patta Salumbar.
23. Dani Chiboda	Patta Salumbar.
24. Daulpura	Patta Salumbar.
25. Cheebora	Patta Salumbar.
26. Namla	Patta Salumbar.
27. Roban	Patta Salumbar.
28. Birpura	Khalsa.
29. Gator	Khalsa.

## R.—Translation of a communication, dated Mangsar Sudi 11, Sambat 1952, from the Foujdar and Kamdar of Salumbar to the Sarara Court.

Last year when His Highness visited Jaisamand you wrote to ask us to preserve the forest in the limits of the villages of Seria, Toda, Thara, Tharora, etc., in the Salumbar patta. This was done and His Highness came and while returning after his *shikar*, he granted us permission to go. Recently an application was received from the Jagirdar of Thara of this patta to the effect that Chandawat Hamir Singhji came from Jawas and being unaware of the restriction, shot a boar in the Forest of Sari. On this account a sowar *dhons* has been sent which is causing great trouble. In reply to the petition we fully instructed the Jagirdar not to allow such a thing to occur in future and he will take the utmost care about this. Hamir Singh who shot the boar unknowingly has been cautioned. It is therefore requested that the sowar *dhons* may be removed from Thara. Last year when we received an order (for shikar) and you wrote to us on the subject we immediately made all arrangements

## Serial No. 1] Grievances of the Rawat of Salumbar against Mewar.

This year when His Highness visited Jaisamand we received no order. You also did not write to us about it and therefore we made no arrangement.

If it is desired in future that arrangements should be made here for shikar and if you write to us we shall inform all the people in our patta and make necessary arrangements and if anyone shoots through ignorance you may inform us and we shall summon him immediately and give him proper warning. You should not send dhons, etc., direct. Please send reply.

S.—The Savar traders of Patta Salumbar allege that the following dues are levied by Salumbar of Sawa:—

Name of article.	Mapa dues per cent.	Khunt dan from local traders.		REMARKS.
		Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	
Cotton	1 8 0	1 2 0	per tanga.	
Jaggery	1 8 0	1 2 0	"	
Cloth	1 8 0	4 8 0	per pothi.	
Opium	1 8 0	4 8 0	"	
Grain	1 8 0	0 9 0	per tanga.	
Tobacco	1 8 0	4 8 0	"	
Til	1 8 0	0 9 0	"	
Sugar	1 8 0	4 8 0	"	
Cocoonut	1 8 0	4 8 0	"	
Ghi	1 8 0	0 6 0	per pothi.	
Spices	1 8 0	4 8 0	"	

Mapa dues on cotton are levied on export and import from traders from outside. Khunt dar is levied from Sawa and local traders.

## I.—MEMORANDUM OF ENQUIRY INTO THE SALUMBAR MATAMPURSI CASE.

I have now been to Salumbar and have heard all that Rawat Unar Singh has to urge and I have inspected the three important documents (as well as shoals of others) on which he relies, and have also heard the Maharana's exposition of his case. As will appear further on the result of a consideration of the evidence on both sides leads me to a conclusion diametrically opposed to that which (I infer) was reached by Major Pinhey, and I, therefore, think it well, at the risk of prolixity, to cite, first Salumbar's case, then Major Pinhey's conclusions and, lastly, the Maharana's reply, reserving my own summing up with my reasons for the end.

2. A.—*Salumbar's case.*—The Rawat's contention, which is that His Highness is bound to go to Salumbar on each occasion to perform the Matampursi ceremony, is supported by various documents, the most important of which are:—

(a) Parwana from Maharana Kumbhaji to Rawat Kundalji, dated Maha Sudi 5, Sambat 1483 (translation attached marked A.).

(b) Parwana (translation marked B.) by Amar Singh II, son of Maharana Jai Singh, to the Rawat of Salumbar, Sambat 1765 (on the subject of Jaisamand), in which (as produced by Salumbar) these words occur:—

"Afterwards Rawat Kundalji died in the Sambat year 1752. On this occasion according to old rights and privilege of Salumbar, the Maharana visited Salumbar and taking the Rawat with him to Udaipur performed the ceremony of *Talvar-bandhai*," and

**Grievances of the Rawat of Salumbar against Mewar. [Serial No. 1**

(c) A Rubkar from Colonel Lawrence to Rawat Kesri Singh, dated 19th July 1855, in which it is assumed that it is the ordinary custom for His Highness to come to Salumbar for the Matampursi ceremony.

I omit other documents as unreliable, being accounts of outsiders of different Maharanas' intentions, or preparations to go because they are *not* evidence of the fact.

Apart from documents, Salumbar states the fact that Maharana Bhim Singh went to Salumbar to instal Rawat Padam Singh, and cites the progress of Sarup Singh towards Salumbar for the alleged purpose of performing the Matampursi ceremony in the case of Kesri Singh; though it is admitted that the Maharana did not go to Salumbar but turned back at Jawar.

3. *Major Pinhey's views.*—Major Pinhey, apparently, assumed the correctness and genuineness of the documents cited above, and he deduced therefrom the conclusion, as a *fact*, that it is the custom for the Maharana to go to Salumbar for Matampursi. In further support of this conclusion, Major Pinhey cites:—

- (a) Brooke's History of Mewar, page 66;
- (b) Colonel Lawrence's report No. 463, dated 31st October 1854, paragraphs 17 and 20 (page 70 of Brooke's History);
- (c) Colonel Eden's report of 1864; and
- (d) Paragraphs 15 and 18 of Captain Brooke's report No. 42, dated 14th February 1853 (pages 12-14 of "Book of Relations of Mewar Chiefs with the Maharana").

4. Major Pinhey then relies on what he describes as "the general consensus of opinion outside the Maharana's own immediate coterie, that it is the custom for the Maharana to go to Salumbar" and concludes that "it is not disputed that the Maharana himself and not the heir-apparent has generally performed this ceremony."

Major Pinhey finally discounts the evidence adduced by the Maharana from the *Patta Bahi* on the grounds that "it is not in original and is always considered by the Jagirdars as a forgery of the time of Sarup Singh, and I do not see how this contention can be disproved until the original has been found."

5. C.—*The Maharana's reply.*—*The Parwana of Maharana Kumbhaji to Rawat Kundalji of Maha Sudi 5, Sambat 1483*, vide paragraph 2 (a) above. The Maharana contends that this document (Appendix A) is a forgery, his grounds for this opinion (besides being based on internal evidence which to my mind would not be conclusive and which I, therefore, ignore), being the *fact* that Kumbhaji did not ascend the *gaddi* till Sambat, 1490. The evidence in support of this, which, if reliable, will dispose not only of this but of most of the other documents produced by Salumbar, is:—

- (a) a stone at Eklingji recording that Mokulji was reigning in 1485; and
- (b) an inscription in Mokul's mandir at Chitor recording the same fact.

Apart, however, from the importance of establishing the authenticity of this document from the point of view, generally, of the genuineness of Salumbar's case, there is nothing in it either establishing or disproving Salumbar's claim regarding the Matampursi ceremony.

6. *Parwana of Amar Singh II to Rawat Kesri Singh, dated Mangsur Sudi 2nd, Sambat 1765* (Appendix B.), vide paragraph 2 (b) above.—According to the Kavi Raja's history and the Darbar records (borne out) to a certain extent, by the pedigree (Translation marked C) put in by Salumbar, in which, however, there are certain obvious errors), Raghunath Singh was, for rebellion, removed from Salumbar by Rana Raj Singh; and *neither his son Rattan Singh, nor his successor Kundalji were ever given Salumbar*. Consequently the opening words of this alleged Parwana condemn it as a forgery, and the "List of Rawats," showing in the 3rd column that the Matampursi ceremony was performed for Kundalji by Rana Raj Singh jat Salumbar, is also false.

7. As regards the Rubkar (paragraph 2 (c)) from Colonel Lawrence, it will be considered later in my own comments. The Darbar naturally ignores it as containing no backing of recorded authority, and obviously begging the question of historic right.

Serial No. 1] *Grievances of the Rawat of Salumbar against Mewar.*

8. His Highness then states as follows :—

- (a) Bhim Singh's son went to perform the Matampuri ceremony at Salumbar on the accession of Bhawani Singhji. Records are with Darbar but have not been traced. Consequently the entry in "List of Rawats" (Appendix C.), etc., in column 3 is false in his case.
- (b) Rana Ebim Singh went for special reasons in the case of Rawat Padam Singh.
- (c) Rawat Kesri Singh's letter (full translation annexed—Appendix D.) to Sarup Singhji is relied upon by His Highness as being a simple statement of fact, in which Kesri Singh says "we pray that Eklingji may give you a son and that he should come." Salumbar contends that this was simply a form of politeness; and that the important point of the letter is that it also says "ancient custom should be observed."

(His Highness here, as opposing the various historical entries from Brooke's<sup>2</sup> history, which, though they cite no authority, are so strongly relied on by Major Pinhey, invites a reference to General Shower's "Missing Chapter of the Indian Mutiny," page 45 *et seq.*, and page 68. His Highness contends that it is as authoritative as Brooke's and Lawrence's *Obiter dicta* which I shall examine further on.)

- (d) Rana Shimbu Singh went to instal Jodh Singh. The Darbar's contention is that Shimbu Singh was absolutely in the hands of the Nobles at that time and did what he was told.
- (e) To Major Pinhey's contention that "it is not disputed that the Maharana himself and not the heir-apparent has generally performed the ceremony," His Highness offers a flat denial. He admits that on two occasions, *i.e.*, Bhim Singh with Padam Singh and Shimbu Singh with Jodh Singh, the ceremony has been performed at Salumbar by the Rana; but denies that it was previously either a practice or a principle; while in regard to the only two recorded instances, there were special reasons in Bhim Singh's case, and Shimbu Singh must not, since he was not a free agent, be counted as a precedent.

The reason why Sarup Singh did not go in Kesri Singh's case are set forth in a *Kharita*, dated 4th July 1855, printed on page 233 of "Relations of the Mewar Chiefs," I attach extract marked "E."

- (f) Finally, as regards the view that the Patta Bahi cannot be relied upon, His Highness represents that Major Pinhey himself, in the Bijolia case (Appendix F.), relied upon the Patta Bahi, and based his decision thereupon; while on its merits he admits frankly that it is only extracts from old papers, some of which are not forthcoming, collected together in convenient form under Bhim Singh's and others' orders, bearing the date of entry in each case and authenticated by the copyist's signature.

It has not been recognized, formally, by the signatures of the Barons, but is invariably referred to, not only by His Highness, but also by them, as being their "Record of Rights" (Appendix G.); though when, as in the present case, the record is adverse to disputant's claim, it is not accepted as authoritative. I attach, too, a copy of an extract from the Patta Bahi in which there is an endorsement by the Foujdars and Kamdars of Rawat Padam Singh which may be read.

9. D. *Finding.*—Before recording my views upon the relative value of the documentary evidence relied on respectively by the Rawat and the Maharana, I must first examine the value, for purposes of an authoritative decision, of the long list of documents cited by Major Pinhey as supporting Salumbar.

I must premise here that Brooke's History of Mewar, though a most convenient record, is riddled with inaccuracies. My predecessors in office here have recorded marginally some of the errors and unfair judgments which mar this work; and I think it is necessary to record this fact because it inculcates the need for caution in accepting, without verification, any statements which he makes which are not backed by other authority. With this *caveat*, I will, to save references, give the extracts relied upon in full from the full record, and not as quoted (some times not *verbatim*) in Brooke's History.

*Paragraph 15 of Report from Captain Brooke, No. 42, dated 14th February 1853* — “The Maharana \* \* adopted the plan of preventing the Rawat coming to Udaipur at all by neglecting the usual honours with which it had been the hereditary right of the Salumbar house to be treated on the death of its head \* \* \*”.

*Paragraph 18 ibid.* — “As the Maharana’s proceeding to Salumbar depended on what had been done on former occasions, a piper, like the one accompanying the list of complaints showing the precedent on this point, was\* drawn out, and it appeared clearly that the Salumbar Chief had right on his side. Of the last seven generations of Rawats, about whom there had been no dispute, on only one occasion had the heir-apparent proceeded to Salumbar, and the reason of his going, according to Salumbar’s statement, and the unbiased account of other parties, was in consequence of the illness of Rana. The Rawat’s agents moreover agree to forego the honour entirely, if the Maharana would write a note to that effect, or if he would say the Salumbar Chief was not intitled to the honour, and his declining to do this was another point in their favour. His Highness eventually agreed to go as far as Dakin Kotra, where the Rawat’s father had died, and stated that, if the Rawat would yield on this point, he would enhance the honour of the family by escorting him back to his house from the palace after the ceremony had been concluded. The other points he proposed to settle by accepting a fine of Rs. 1,001 (the highest that custom allows to be levied on Salumbar) and the Nezrana on investiture or *talwar bandhai* he agreed to commute (on my expressing my astonishment at his requiring such a charge from Salumbar) to the presentation of the customary *nazar* on the occasion of the Maharana’s visiting the Rawat’s house, which His Highness proposed to do. Even these terms were not yielded without great hesitation and after many interviews, but I did not think them likely to satisfy the demands of the Rawat. When I visited the latter at Salumbar shortly afterwards, he treated the terms contemptuously, and sneered at the extreme eagerness for money manifested in His Highness’ proposals.”

*Paragraph 17 of Colonel Lawrence’s No. 463, dated 31st October 1854* — “I have also not touched upon the original grievance of this Chief in regard to the Maharana not having paid him the usual honour of repairing to Salumbar to invest him with the Sword conceiving that it would be preferable verbally to tell the Rana to do so. than to insert it in the *qaunnam* which would involve a loss of dignity to His Highness, as I know the desire of the British Government is to uphold, as much as possible, the dignity of Native Princes. I have, therefore, informed the Rana and the Chiefs that the former will be required to perform the usual ceremony, and, failing to do so, the Salumbar Rawat will not be expected to attend at Udaipur, though he will have to furnish the quota of troops.”

*Paragraph 20 of Colonel Lawrence’s No. 463, dated the 31st October 1854.* — “This Chief’s only complaint, when I assumed charge of this Agency in November 1850, was, that the Rana had refused or rather, neglected, repairing to his castle, according to custom, to invest him; that this not having been done he had not been to Udaipur to pay his respects, and that the Rana had in consequence confiscated several of his villages. Colonel Low, without admitting the validity of his plea, pointed out to him that both he and Deogarh, though they absented themselves from court, should have sent their quotas for service. It seems to me that the Salumbar Chief is himself to blame; his father was contumacious mainly at his instigation, and he quarrelled with the Maharana before His Highness’ accession; no wonder then that his sovereign should scruple to give him the usual honours; his and the Deogarh Chief’s expulsion of the Rana’s troops from their confiscated villages, thus putting the greatest indignity in their power on their sovereign, must be also borne in mind.”

*-Colonel Eden’s letter (paragraphs 7 and 11) No. 71-35-P., dated 2nd June 1864.* — “*Paragraph 7.* — This led to the communications marked “A,” “B.” and “C.” translations of which are appended—apart from conferences or interviews with the Chiefs or the Agents of Salumbar and Badaisar. At one time a settlement seemed imminent, but the Chiefs dread to assume responsibility and their action now is to secure from the Political Agent some sign or expression of opinion that may shift that responsibility on to the shoulders of others. My own conclusion is, that since the majority of them now lean to the recognition of Jodh Singh they have simply, in observance with the practice existing, to escort the

\*It is not stated by whom.

---

 Serial No. 1] Grievances of the Rawat of Salumbar against Mewar.
 

---

young Rana to Salumbar for the purpose of conveying Jodh Singh to Udaipur to invest him with the insignia of succession. I do not apprehend instant opposition or disturbance; the ordinary course observed by those whose claims are over-looked in such cases is generally to take to a predatory life for a time and seek to inflict all the mischief in their power on the estate and subjects of the usurping Chief. To arrest this species of retaliation, the Salumbar people say that they are quite able and prepared, while the previous compromise adopted by the sardars has been qualified and improved by the offer of villages of Salumbar to the legitimate, though rejected, heir, to the amount of five thousand rupees a year—so that I cannot very well understand the present dilatory and obscure proceedings of the Sardars in differing their co-operation and giving effect to a decision the majority of them have arrived at \*

“Paragraph 11.—I would thank you for an early reply to this communication. I repeat I do not anticipate any disturbance in the first instance, while I still hold it essential not to relieve the feudatories from their share of responsibilities. The Note from the Maji Chao-reeji to the Sardars, of the 8th May 1864, must be taken as applying to the vacillation and apathy of these Nobles. I have thrown no obstacles, in the way of a solution of the question and its final settlement. I have adhered strictly to the intentions of my Government last conveyed to me by your predecessor. When informed that the Sardars were preparing to take the Rana to Salumbar to bring matters to a conclusion I expressed my satisfaction and hoped simply that all points had been well considered and digested before conveying their young Chief on such an important mission. This in all probability raised misconceptions as well as apprehensions as to their ability to give full effect to their intentions and which deterred them from any further or immediate action.”

10. The above are all the authorities cited by Major Pinney, and it will be observed that, beyond a vague reference to the “usual custom,” etc., they afford no information as to the authority on which such ancient custom rests; and therefore are themselves of questionable weight. Great stress is laid on the fact that Saroop Singh would not declare that Salumbar was not entitled to the presence of the Maharana at Salumbar for the Matampuri ceremony. Having regard to the resemblance supposed to exist between Saroop Singh and the present Maharana Fateh Singh, I do not think too much weight ought to be attached to this, inasmuch as His present Highness would be most reluctant, without the strictest proof, to declare that a right claim did not exist; and even at the present moment, convinced as he is of the absence of such right, I doubt whether he would think himself justified in declaring that no such right was recognised, lest evidence should hereafter turn up to show he was in the wrong.

II. I must now supplement Major Pinney’s quotations by others from the same authority which seem to me to qualify the inference he draws as to the views of the officers of Government in the fifties.

(a) First I would draw particular attention to some of the words of Captain Brooke himself in paragraph 15 of the report of 14th February 1858 above referred to—“at the same time he” (the Maharana) “doubtless considered it would be politic to abolish some of those” (Salumbar’s) “honours.”

(b) My next quotation, on the face of it, a stronger one for Salumbar’s case than any cited by Major Pinney, is the rubkar of the Mewar Agency of 20th July 1855 from the Resident, Colonel G. St. P. Lawrence, relied on by Salumbar, in which Colonel Lawrence says:—“The right of the Salumbar Chief to be installed at Salumbar is admitted by the Maharana, but, as the Rawat has in no way been wanting in disloyalty and disobedience, it is necessary that he should first sign the qaulnama and obey it, having done which his Highness will be requested to go to Salumbar.”

But, in the first place, it shows a misunderstanding of the whole situation, since even the Rawat has never claimed that the Maharana should *install* him at Salumbar (that, it is admitted, is done at Udaipur); and, in the next, it indicates that any so-called rights, which may have been conferred on the Chiefs, may *as* (is of course obvious) be either withheld or revoked as a punishment for “disloyalty and disobedience.”

## Grievances of the Rawat of Salumbar against Mewar. [Serial No. 1

(c) I have referred above to certain inaccuracies of Captain Brooke's, as a caution against attaching too much weight to that officer's opinions ; and I feel compelled further to draw attention to the following extract from Sir Henry Lawrence's letter No. 39, dated 21st August 1855, to the Secretary to the Government of India. I will quote paragraph 10 in full ; it and the later comments in the same letter, seem to me to indicate that in Sir Henry Lawrence's opinion Captain Brooke was unconsciously a partisan of the Chiefs against the Maharana.

*Paragraph 10.*—“As Colonel Lawrence had already done I reasoned with the more moderate Chiefs and Vakils. I also assured them that all Captain Brooke's and my predecessor's reports and opinions had been submitted to Government, and that there was no need for their sending Vakils with ill-translated petitions to Calcutta, as I would be happy to submit any statement they would write. Nevertheless, in their petitions of 17th March and 23rd May, sent to me with your letter No. 1977 of 1st June, they insinuate that Captain Brooke's reports and other papers were submitted, and they repeat the *cuckoo* cry “we cannot get a bearing.” They say, as they had often before said, we are ready to abide by the orders of Government, “only first hear us.” In the petition of 25th May they ask for a new Commissioner, “as Colonel Lawrence has already made up his mind in favour of the Rana.” It is not clear whether the Political Agent or myself is thus noticed. They evidently, however, desire that Captain Brooke should be the arbitrator, because they consider that he has made up his mind in *their* favour. Such also is the Maharana's opinion, and such having been the general impression, I discussed the qaulnama with that officer several times, and also invited him to go over it article by article with me. Eventually Colonel Lawrence called on him to record his official opinion on the several clauses. His reply is given in the enclosure A, to the effect that “the compromise for both chatund and service is fair.”

“*Talwar-bandhai*, or investiture, perfectly fair, nazrana he considers heavy, especially when made to bear retrospectively. He would also make the nazar on pilgrimage voluntary. The authoritative forbiddal of banjgurria or hereditary councillorship, he considers objectionable and opposed to Colonel Tod's qaulnama. He concludes, however, with the opinion that the general spirit of the qaulnama “appears perfectly fair.”

(d) Sir Henry Lawrence's advice to the Rawat of Salumbar is reported as follows in paragraph 26 of the same :—

“I explained that he had really *nothing* to do with the grievances of the other Chiefs and that it was nonsense in the present state of feeling between himself and the Maharana his pretending to the premiership ; that when they became *real* friends, then we should be glad of the closest connection, but that the time for forcible banjgurria (hereditary councillorship) had passed. I said we had advised the Rana to come to Salumbar to instal him as was the custom, but, considering the violent feud between them and the bad health of His Highness, we did not wonder he should decline. I added that by this, he, the Rao, would rather be the gainer, as his right to be so installed should be maintained unless forfeited by continued misconduct, and, until the Rana came to him, he need not attend the Rana, which he was bound to do during the *whole year*, and therefore that he had nothing to do but to abide by the terms of the qaulnama and furnish his contingent, in which case the Rana would have no power to injure or annoy him.”

(It will be observed that “custom” and “right” are the words used interchangeably, and I would only remark that Sir Henry Lawrence's information on the point was necessarily limited to that supplied to him by the Residents in the papers already quoted from.)

12. My conclusions in regard to the value of the evidence furnished from the official statements of previous Residents is then, that they were based upon a personal of Salumbar's papers and had not been tested by an examination of the past history of Salumbar house. They adduce no documentary proof in support of their general conclusions.

13 I have now to examine His Highness' refutation of the \*document, dated 1483 (Appendix A) ; and to consider how far this refutation affects the question of the *Matampursi* ceremonial, as affirmed in Appendix B.

\* *Vide* paragraph 2 (a) and paragraph 5 above.

## Serial No. 1] Grievances of the Rawat of Salumbar against Mewar.

I have verified the existence of both the inscriptions relied upon by His Highness; but as the one at Chitor is the later of the two, and also the more complete, it alone need be dealt with at length. Please see Burgess' "Epigraphia, Indica," volume II, page 408, from which it is abundantly clear that, in the year Sambat 1485, they were paying for a continuance of Mokulji's rule. There is, there, no question possible as to the document put in by Salumbar being a forgery\*.

14. Now the importance of this discovery can hardly be exaggerated. I do not suppose for a moment that the present Rawatji knows it is a forgery; for it has been waived as the *Magna Charta* of Salumbar during the whole of the last half century and has been accepted, without question, by successive Residents. Though not bearing, *totidem verbis*, upon the claim that the Maharanas should in person proceed to Salumbar for the *Matampursi* ceremony, the fact that it is not genuine necessitates the closest scrutiny of such remaining documents, from Salumbar, as do bear on that question; and, for the purposes of such examination, it is no longer possible to ignore the contention, consistently urged by His Highness, that there is internal evidence that neither it, nor the later document (Appendix B) of Sambat 1765, was ever issued from Udaipur. It would be tedious, and, as will appear from an examination of the history of Salumbar with reference to the later Parwana, unnecessary, to dive in detail into those verbal irregularities which His Highness points out; and I will only remark that there is the one word *Matampursi*, which is written, in the Salumbar documents, "Matang Pursi," whereas in no document on record in Udaipur is it spelt otherwise than with the "m." The fact would be important evidence were it necessary; but for the reasons which follow it is needless to pursue this.

15. Appendix B (paragraphs 2 (b) and 6 above) opens by saying—"When the late Maharanee was going to construct the Jaisagar lake, Rawat Kundalji represented that when he was installed he was granted a patta of assurance in Sambat 1739, etc," and in the perinama (pedigree) put in by the Rawat (Appendix C) it is shown that Rawat Raghunath Singh, Ratan Singh and Kandalji were *Matampursi* d at Salumbar by Rana Raj Singh. In view of the falsity of Appendix A, I have taken some trouble to get at the history of these times more especially since His Highness represented that two of those three Rawats never were at Salumbar at all. Pandit Gauri Shankar is the best authority available locally, or, probably, anywhere; and, in the course of his researches in connection with his archaeological work, and with his post of Private Secretary of the late Kavi Raja (to whom he supplied all the materials for his valuable history), he has recorded notes from which I extract the following, on the correctness of which he (Gauri Shankar) takes his (not inconsiderable) reputation:—

"In Shah Jehan's time a Munshi named Chandra Bharan came to Udaipur Court from Delhi, and this man wrote to his master praising Rawat Raghunath Singh so much that Rana Raj Singh became displeased with him, suspecting machinations on the Rawat's part. There were also other reasons in Raj Singh's mind for questioning Raghunath's loyalty. Therefore, Rana Raj Singh, in A. D. 1668 (Sambat 1725) deprived Raghunath Singh of all his Jagirs. Raghunath Singh, then an old man, went off to Delhi with his son and served Aurangzeb—at all events was in Delhi in Aurangzeb's time. He died there. His son, Rattan Singh returned on his death and received the Jagir of Chavand (in the Hilly Tracts).

"Meanwhile, on the exile of Raghunath Singh, Rana Raj Singh had given Salumbar to the Chohan Chief of Parsoli.

"Jai Singh succeeded Raj Singh, and after a few years Jai Singh's son, Amar Singh (who afterwards succeeded him) rebelled against his father, and actually, at one time, turned Jai Singh out of Udaipur (A. D. 1691). During this quarrel the Chohan (Kesri Singh) at Salumbar took the side of the son, Amar Singh, while the Chandawat (*i.e.*, the son Kundalji of Rattan Singh who was now dead) took Jai Singh's side, and was Jai Singh's leading man.

\* Curiously enough the pedigree, with dates of the Maharanas, put in by Salumbar (Appendix H) corroborate the Darbar contention, by giving date of Mukalji's demise as 1490. The pedigree is, of course, not authoritative, but its corroboration of history and condemnation of Appendix A is of interest.

**Grievances of the Rawat of Salumbar against Mewar. [Serial No. 1]**

"The position of Raj Singh's time was thus exactly reversed in Jai Singh's reign, and the Chandawat Kundalji was in favour while the Chohan Kesri Singh of Parsoli, who had supplanted Chandaji's line in Salumbar, was a danger to the throne.

"Jai Singh, therefore, told Kundalji that if he would kill Kesri Singh, he, Kundalji, should be reinstated at Salumbar. To facilitate matters, Jai Singh sent a message to Kesri Singh to come in, in order that matters should be discussed between them. Kesri Singh came, was met by Kundalji and engaged in conversation, and suddenly stabbed by the latter. Kesri Singh, however, was more ready than was expected for he grappled with Kundalji, managed to get out his knife, and slew Kundalji before dying himself.

"Jai Singh kept his word to the Chandawats, and put in Kundalji's son—named also Kesri Singh—in 1692 A. D. Peace was concluded between Jai Singh and his son Amar Singh, and Jai Singh died in 1698 A. D.

16. The following inferences are to be drawn from the fact cited:—

- (a) Neither Rattan Singh nor Kundalji can have been Matampursi'd at Salumbar, since neither ever was installed here. Therefore the perinama (Appendix C) is erroneous.
- (b) The statements in Appendix B are unreliable inasmuch as:—
  - (i) Kundalji can have made no representation, or
  - (ii) he can have been granted no patta of assurance in Sambat 1739 (A. D. 1681 or 1682, and
  - (iii) he cannot have enjoyed the alluvial of Jaisamand up to Sambat 1751 (A. D. 1692-93).

In these circumstances it is, to my mind, impossible to place any reliance upon any part of this document. It struck me, when it was produced at Salumbar, that it was curiously identical in hand-writing and general appearance, with the earlier, and with other later documents, and that it was a suspicious circumstance that, in a parwana dealing with a specific subject, viz., the alluvial at Jaisamand—a wholly irrelevant paragraph about the Matampursi should have been interpolated.

The Darbar have not urged either of these points, but I mention them as being circumstances which raised some curiosity in my own mind before I had heard any part of the Darbar's evidence.

17. In regard to paragraph 8 (a) above, dealing with the accession of Bhawani Singhji I am unable to obtain any documentary authority on either side (since the perinama—Appendix C—is discredited) but His Highness says it is a well-known fact that Bhim Singh's son went to instal Bhawani Singhji.

18. My summing up of this case need, I think, only be brief. This is the first occasion on which, in the course of the investigation of this matter, the documents and other statements on either side have been put to the test of recorded history, and the result seems to me to be clearly as follows:—

- (a) None of the Salumbar evidence regarding old custom is of any value.
- (b) The conclusions of Political officers in the past, based on verbal statements of interested parties, were mistaken.
- (c) It is only certain that on two occasions did a Mahatana go to Matampursi at Salumbar:—
  - (i) Rana Bhim Singh went in the case of Padam Singh, when, the Darbar contend, this was done at the special prayer of the Maji at Salumbar who said that unless the Rana brought him there himself the Rawat (then a boy) would be murdered; and
  - (ii) Shimbu Singh, when a boy of 13, was taken by the Nobles, in whose hands he was entirely, to Matampursi Jodh Singh.
- (d) It is not necessary to rely solely, or even largely, upon the authority of the disputed Patta Bahi; but, in view of Appendix F, it is not fair to condemn it as worthless. An examination of it shows that it has all the appearance of being a careful summary of previous documents, and its statement that the Maharaj Kunwar performs the Matampursi is entitled (especially in view of Appendix G) to as much weight as any documentary evidence adduced on either side.

## Serial No. 1] Grievances of the Rawat of Salumbar against Mewar.

(e) Kesri Singh's letter (Appendix D) must, like any other document, be interpreted strictly; and the suggestion by Salumbar that it conveys no admission, but is only a polite aspiration, would have greater weight if there were any real evidence of the existence of any claim on Salumbar's part.

## II.—INTERFERENCE BY DARBAR IN ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE.

1. A. *Salumbar's case*.—The Rawat states that he and his ancestors, from Chandaji's time, have always exercised full civil and criminal powers within their estate without any interference on the part of the Darbar. He relies:—

- (1) On the Parwana, dated Mangsar Sudi 1, Sambat 1755, from Rana Amar Singh to Rawat Kesri Singh, which reads—  
"You are ordered to punish the criminals in the Jagirdars', Nobles' and Khalsa villages in the Chapan Pargana. If any one complains, the Darbar will not attend to the complaint."
- (2) On the wording of the Parwana of Maharana Kumbhaji of 1483 (already disposed of as being a forgery) (*vide note on Matimparsi case*).
- (3) On the refusal of Kesri Singh in Sambat 1936 (1878) to subscribe to the agreement entered into by the other Nobles defining their procedure and powers in the Civil and Criminal cases; the refusal being based on the ground that he already had full judicial powers.

(The history of this, and the set of rules, appears in the Administration Reports for 1878-79, 1880-81 and 1881-82.)

2. B. *Darbar's case*.—His Highness points out that, whatever may have been the original intention in regard to Chandaji's successors, that has, of necessity, been modified by the events of history. Not only has the Salumbar house been frequently in rebellion, thus absolving the Darbar from their obligations, which were obviously contingent on the loyalty of Chandaji's house; but also for two generations, *viz.*, in the time of Rawats Raghunath Singh, Rattan Singh and Kundalji, they were actually exiled from Salumbar, and their lands at Amet and Salumbar were resumed. Consequently it is idle to appeal to any intentions expressed antecedently to Rana Raj Singh's time when the above exile was ordained.

## 3. Descending to particulars—

- (a) With regard to the Parwana of 1755, His Highness will not dispute its genuineness because he has nothing to establish its falsity; but he maintains that it amounts to a commission to Rawat Kesri Singh personally, probably in connection with some specific emergency, giving him special powers to deal with certain districts. It is contended that it is personal to Kesri Singh, and conveys no hereditary powers to the Rawats of Salumbar. His Highness points out that an order empowering a Hakim specially would be couched in very similar terms, and that, if he were given summary powers, they would be given somewhat in the terms of the last sentence.
- (b) The Parwana of 1483 requires no further notice.
- (c) As to the refusal of Kesri Singh, in Sambat 1936, His Highness points out that, if his various insubordinations are to be taken as evidence of his right, there will be no end to Salumbar's claims. Kesri Singh disputed and fought over every point and never submitted. This is, of course, borne out by history. His Highness contends that the autograph letter relied on by the Rawat (from Rana Sajjan Singh to Jodh Singh) dated Sambat 1936, inviting him to join a committee to consider some rules (then recently proposed, and which are assumed to be the rules subscribed to, in 1878, by the other Nobles) cannot be interpreted as an admission that the Salumbar estate was entitled to special powers; and I confess I cannot see how such an interpretation can be read into it.
- (d) But His Highness' main contention is this—approximately in his own words.—  
"I am responsible for good government in Mewar. You (the Sirkar) enquire into complaints, whether from the Khalsa or the Jagirs, and you enquire of me. Am I not to

**Grievances of the Rawat of Salumbar against Mewar. [Serial No. 1**

listen to complaints against the Rawat or to pay attention to petitions alleging gross injustice on the part of his administration? Certain serious offences are reserved for trial in the Daibar Courts; when complaints in such cases are received, I order my officials to enquire into them. This order is communicated to the Rawat whose help is requested. The official, whoever it be—Hakim or Naib—who is charged with the enquiry, is required to summon the parties *through* the Rawat. If there were co-operation there would be no undue *dastandazi* (interference). Since there is no co-operation, and since, to any enquiry as to facts or the truth of complaints, the only reply is that the case has been enquired into and justice has been done, and since no further information or help is given, it is necessary for my officers to send for the parties direct and hold the enquiry without the help of the Rawats' officials."

4. *C. General Summary.*—There is, so far as I can gather, as much to be said on one side as the other as to the causes of friction.

On the question of constitutional right it is very difficult to form a just conclusion. The Rawat, rightly or wrongly, believes that the document of 1755 was intended to give perpetual jurisdiction. It is worthy of remark that, if the dates of accession of the Ranas, as given by the Rawat, are correct, this Parwana was issued in the year of Jai Singh's death, and of Amar Singh's accession, as one of the first acts towards the son of the man who had fought for Jai Singh against Amar Singh (see History where dealing with the Matampuri case). On the other hand, it is quite natural that, after an exile for three generations of this branch of the family of Chandaji, the Rana of the time should give him a patent of sorts. But the fact remains that the patent is personal and does not specify that the right conferred was to descend; and the Maharana's contention is that a re-instatement of the Salumbar house after an exile, for disloyalty, makes a complete break in any *pre-existing* hereditary rights, and reduces the position of the family to that conferred in the new grant. Indeed His Highness' personal view is that the Chandawats would come below any nobles who had their jagirs given to them prior to this re-instatement, and who had retained them since without a break—e.g., B-dla. I think that this position—on the analogy of feudal tenures the world over—is defensible and that interference with it could hardly be justified. The possession by Chandaji's children of Salumbar would, in this view, carry with it none of the special rights which were originally conferred but which were forfeited with the loss of the estate. The re-grant was an act of favour and started the descendants on the same terms as that of other Jagirdars.

5. In my endeavours to arrive at the true value of this Parwana of 1755, I asked the Maharana whether he could show me any similar one. He has now complied and I attach copies of translations of 5 (Appendices J. to N.). It will be seen that some of them do, in a sense, correspond with the Parwana granted in 1755, in the absolute power conferred and in the absence of a time limitation. His Highness remarked that if all such documents were produced by the present possessors, and were held to entitle them to the powers conferred on their ancestors, there would be no power left to any Rana in Mewar; and his suggestion to me was that it might perhaps be held that such warrants might be compared to those granted to a military officer commanding in the field in a foreign country—he himself suggested the analogy of a British General Commanding an Army occupying Cabul—a not inept comparison. I think, taking all the arguments into consideration, that the sanad was probably not designed to bear the construction of a *hereditary* patent, conferring complete administrative independence upon Kesri Singh's successors. To take the view that it was so designed would, indeed, be a very dangerous precedent, as there is hardly a Sadar in Mewar who could not produce a Khat of some sort, from one or other of the Ranas, conferring at least as great a degree of power and independence on some individual ancestor; and these would also have to be admitted as giving partial independence.

6. I now come to the Judicial rules to which Kesri Singh II refused to subscribe; and I invite a perusal of paragraph 16 of the Mewar Agency \*report dated 1st May 1879, for the year 1878. It is remarkable:—

(a) The Shahpura, whose position in these days is far more independent than that of Salumbar, was the first to agree to these rules;

\*Printed on page 16 of Selections, etc., No. CLXII.,

Serial No. 1] Grievances of the Rawat of Salumbar against Mewar.

(b) That Salumbar was not the only Jagir which stood out then. Small and new creations, such as Meja and Bansi, stood out then and still stand out. I cannot quite accept the argument therefore, that Salumbar's holding aloof was proof of this *right* to special treatment, or that the conciliatory letter of Maharana Sajjan Singh, inviting the Rawat to join a committee (assumed to be on this subject), is proof of any feeling on the Maharana's part that Salumbar was *entitled* to stand out.

I have examined all the original papers connected with the appointment of this committee, and have had read out to me from the original documents,\* the 23 heads of complaints from the Sardars which Sajjan Singh referred to this committee, also the office copy of the Khat issued to all the Sardars; and I find that the terms of this Khat are identical with those of the document relied on by the Rawat. There is thus no doubt that this letter from Sajjan Singh to the Rawat was *not* a special letter but a copy of one sent to all the other Sardars, and that the committee upon which it invited him to serve (needless to say, he refused) was *not* the committee which drew up the judicial rules which were so beneficial.

8. My conclusion then is, on a consideration of all the circumstances, that the Rawat of Salumbar possesses no right to the exercise of special criminal or civil powers above those exercised by other first class nobles of the State. Whether it will be politic to grant any such right as a personal distinction is a matter for consideration hereafter.

#### IV — MINOR COMPLAINTS.

A. *Salumbar's case and Darbar's reply.*—In his petition (Kharita) of the 24th July 1906, copy of which was forwarded to the Darbar, paragraph 10 *et seq.*, deal with alleged minor grievances or specific wrongs. It is strictly unnecessary to examine them in connection with the main issues, since, once the big questions are disposed of, these, which are only padding to add to the strength of Salumbar's main contention, will be dropped.

It is, indeed, a great pity that Salumbar's Kharita was forwarded to the Darbar for the reason that its language, which in places is most improper, is not calculated to secure a conciliatory attitude on the part of the Darbar; and I do not propose the Rawat imagined that it would be sent on bodily. It is, of course, contrary to all etiquette and precedent for a Sardar to appeal officially to the Resident on matters within the control of the Darbar; and it would have been perhaps easier to secure a settlement had the grievance alleged been the subject of informal diplomatic discussion. I should not have gone into these minor points then, but for the Darbar's special desire that I should do so; and as I had patiently listened for 3 days to Salumbar's version of the alleged acts of injustice and oppression, I could not refuse to hear the Darbar's case; and, for reasons which will appear it is perhaps as well to have done so.

2. Salumbar produced nothing new, but practically recapitulated all that was stated in paragraph 10 to the end of his Kharita. I will therefore, in each case, quote the paragraph concerned and follow it by the Darbar's explanation.

3. *Paragraph 10 of the Kharita.*—“Jharole, Khejar and Karavli are first class villages of this patta which were caused to be looted by the Bhils of Natharia, Sarara Beras. Correspondence on the subject took place and some property was restored after recovering  $\frac{1}{4}$ th, the rest has not been restored to us. The offenders concerned were let off unpunished. The Raj courts stated that the cattle were taken away in lieu of Chouth. It is a matter for consideration that the plunder of the villages of this patta, on the plea of recovering Chouth, is considered to constitute no crime. It appears that the Udaipur officials deliberately induced the offenders to commit the crime, and encouraged the Mewar Pals to destroy the villages of this Patta. List No. 5 attached herewith shows the loss sustained from the robbery and it is requested that steps may be taken to have the loss compensated.”

4. The case of each of these villages was explained to me in detail separately by the Darbar; and since all have been dealt with very similarly, I think I need only quote below,

\*Of the year Sambat 1956.

## Grievances of the Rawat of Salumbar against Mewar. [Serial No. 1]

at length, the report of the Hakim on the alleged plundering of Jharole. No comment is called for:—

## Complainants.

“Zamindars of Jharole, patta Salumbar,  
through the Foujdar and Kamdar of Salumbar.

## Accused.

Bhils of the Pal of Natharia.

## Charge.—Lifting cattle while grazing in the jungle.

“The Thanedar of Jharole, reported to the court in the evening of Bhadon budi 5, Sambat 1959, that the accused carried away cattle. In the meantime, Bihari, Havildar of the Thana of Natharia also reported the case to the Court. An Ablmad of the Foujdari accompanied by a guard was sent to the place of the occurrence to enquire into the case. He reported that the complainants were not present at the place or in the Thana of Natharia and that the people of Jharole who were asked to attend responded to the call only after a very long time. They were told to have an enquiry made into the case but they refused to depose and the Thanedar of Jharole stated that he would have an enquiry made into the case only after Mirza Amin Beg of Salumbar's arrival at the place who was at the time at Khejar. Even on the arrival of the Mirza they refused to have their depositions recorded. The Foujdar and Kamdar of Salumbar were thereupon asked to direct the complainants to have an enquiry made. On making an enquiry from the *gametis* of Natharia, they stated that the Jharole people would not pay Chouth as they had always done, in spite of repeated requests; that they killed Kacha Bhil while walking on the road and carried away Besata Bhil who has not yet been liberated, and that they had brought away the cattle while grazing in the jungle to settle their differences. That out of the cattle brought away, a few buffaloes had been killed and consumed by them and they produced the remaining 52 animals, namely, 47 she-buffaloes, 2 cows, 2 calves and one male buffalo calf. They requested that their feud may be settled and the Chouth paid to them.”

“The complainants stated that the following animals of their village were taken away—

She-buffaloes	170
Cows	14
Male-buffalo-calves	6

and that as regards Chouth there was an agreement between them that if there be no case of theft they would pay Chouth. The cattle which were produced were, therefore, restored to the complainants after recovering R229-6 on account of court-fee, R217 on account of cost of grazing and R32 on account of serving their she-buffaloes with their buffaloes. After this the Jharole people deposed that they had allotted 7½ *manis* of grain, Rs. 12 in cash on account of cloth, 12 bundles of tobacco, 12 rupees' weight of opium and 12 liquor stills in payment of one year's Chouth and requested that the remaining cattle may be restored to them. The *gametis* were thereupon consulted and both the parties after consulting each other, expressed a desire of referring the matter for settlement to a Panchayat. Panches were therefore selected and a Panchayat formed. The members of the Panchayat

- (1) Kamlachand Patwari of Bargam.
- (2) Gautam Kothari of Parsad.
- (3) Patel Sawa of Kejar, Patta Salumbar.
- (4) Patel Dalla of Salara.
- (5) Gameti Dhula of Sigtari.
- (6) Gameti Harji.
- (7) Raminga of Pal Sarara.

noted in the margin who were selected by both the parties unanimously put forward a proposal on Asadh budi 6, Sambat 1960, that in addition to the cattle returned to the complainants they should be given 25 she-buffaloes, 5 she-buffalo-calves, and one male-buffalo-calf by Natharia Pal and that they should in future recover their Chouth as fixed by the

Jharole people. The parties agreed to the proposal and signed an agreement to that effect. The court concurred in the proposal and decided that, according to the award of the Panchayat, the remaining animals should be made over to the complainants after recovering the court-fee, and that the complainants should be directed to pay Chouth regularly according to the agreement. The Court further observed that, if the Natharia people had any claim, the regular course was to seek redress in the Court, but, as they had failed to do so, the Court imposed a fine of R51 upon the *gametis* of Natharia. The Salumbar authorities state that the Natharia people committed a *dakai*, carried away the cattle and destroyed Jharol

---

 Serial No. 1] Grievances of the Rawat of Salumbar against Mewar.
 

---

and that the Court supported the accused. The fact is, however, that the Natharia people were extremely harassed by the Thanedar of Jharole and the Salumbar officials. On their bringing a claim in the Court, the Mehmka Khas, and the Foujdar and Kamdar of Salumbar were frequently asked to prevent them (Salumbar officials) from harrassing the Natharia people, and the Natharia people were always warned by the Court to avoid friction and quarrel, and they continued to suffer their oppression silently solely because the Court pressed them to keep quiet, but the Foujdar and Kamdar of Salumbar not only took no action in the matter, but also stopped the Chouth which Natharia claims from Jharole. The people of Natharia repeatedly asked the Jharole people to pay the Chouth, but, whenever the villagers showed their willingness to settle the matter, the estate authorities always threw obstacles in their way. The Natharia people carried away the cattle only when they were driven to the necessity, with a view to settle the matter of Chouth, and protect themselves from the oppression of the Salumbar officials, and, in the circumstances, the carrying away of the cattle cannot be called a dakaiti. If they had taken the cattle with a criminal intention, they would have hesitated to produce the animals and not expressed their desire to come to an amicable settlement. They carried away the cattle according to the usual practice, simply with a view to have their grievances redressed to settle the matter of Chouth, and remove the cause of friction, as stated by them during the enquiry. When the Jharole people would not pay their Chouth and they were beaten and imprisoned without cause, and were not released despite the orders of the Court and the Mehmka Khas, and were detained in custody for long periods, how long could they (Natharia people) suffer such oppression. The way in which these innocent people have been harrassed and oppressed will appear from the following. In the month of Katik in Sambat 1658, when Ratna, Amra, Punja, Lala, Jiya, Saria and others of the village of Natharia, who were carrying bundles of hay to Jaisamand, stopped for the night in Bejpur, a hamlet of Jharole, 10 or 12 armed Sowars and sepoyes, employés of Salumbar estate came and beat them. They also beat Rughnath Singh Sipahi who was with the party, seized and carried away their guns, weapons, cash and other property, and imprisoned the Bhils in a room in Jherole. Marks of hurt were found on the bodies of the Bhils and a doctor's certificate was obtained to that effect. Again, Bisatia Bhil was arrested and imprisoned without fault in the same year. They also arrested and put fetters on Pemla, Hira, Pania, Kanjars and others of Natharia, who were going to Jaisamand to receive cloth, which was being distributed there in charity, and released them on their agreeing to pay a fine of Rs 11 per head and Rs 6 on account of khara beri. Similarly, Kishen Singh, Thanedar of Jharole, and others, arrested, in the limits of the Khalsa village of Kesarsia, Hira, Bheria, Rupa, and others of Natharia who were going to Methuri to fetch their grain, imprisoned them in a room and fined them Rs 60. The Salumbar authorities are so bent on oppressing the Natharia people that the estate preferred a claim for 500 animals while the assamis of Jharole stated that only 190 animals were carried away. The reason why the Natharia people did not retaliate, in spite of the oppression exercised by Salumbar is because the court always held them in restraint and warned them not to disturb the peace; otherwise they would have committed such excesses that they would not have stopped at murder. In short, the treatment accorded by the Salumbar authorities is known to every body. The Natharia people acted with the object of getting their dispute settled. The people of the villages of Harmatia, Manpur, Budel, Rathri, Kachria, and others of Patta Salumbar have committed such crimes, in Dungarpur and Mewar territories, that complaints of the mismanagement prevailing there have attracted the attention of the Hon'ble the Agent to the Governor-General. The falseness of Salumbar's complaints and their real intention will be apparent if measures are taken for the repression of crime. In the case of dakiti committed on cattle in Sabla, Jahapura of Dungarpur, the accused of the Pals of Patta Salumbar were made to abscond and were not produced, though repeatedly called for. They were asked to produce Dhulia Bajania, who figured as a ring-leader in a few recent cases, but he, too, was made to abscond. Subsequently the Salumbar authorities obtained some money from him and other accused who had absconded and allowed them to settle in their original homes and did not produce them. Is this the way of preventing crime? Many criminals are thus let off for their personal benefit. They, themselves, pay fines imposed on the criminals and recover double or triple from

them subsequently. The Court deals impartially and an offender is sure to get punishment. The Salumbar authorities are aware that troops are always maintained in the Court for the very purpose. If the Court had sided and supported the Khalsa Pals, as is alleged by the Salumbar authorities, it would have been impossible to maintain peace in the Mewar district. It was with the sole object of maintaining peace that a few of the Khalsa Pals were punished as is known to the higher authorities. They are accustomed to attribute their own failings to others."

5. *Paragraph 11 of the Kharita reads—*

"When there is any cause of complaint against the Pals of this patta, the estate takes coercive measures against them. But in this case, the State marched troops against the village of Gamra, without giving notice of the fact to the authorities of the estate, plundered and ruined the Bhils and respectable persons of the village, setting fire to the houses of the former. We corresponded on the subject with the State officials and, as a result of this, only a few persons were released, and a portion of the plundered property returned, on recovering Chouth as their share. This has totally ruined the estate and affected injuriously the revenue of the estate. A list showing the extent of loss sustained by the plunder is enclosed herewith."

6. The report on the case to the Darbar is as follows:—

"Complaints have, from time to time, been made from the time of the late Hakim, i.e., Sambat 1944, of the lawlessness, dacoities, robberies, injuries, murders and thefts committed by the Bhils of the Pal. The Foujdar and Kamdar of Salumbar have repeatedly been addressed by the Foujdari Court and asked to take preventive measures but without any result. The estate has always sided with the *badmash* Pal and has tried to defend it by submitting protests in response to the claims preferred by the complainants. In a case of theft of *ghi* belonging to Nagrup, Mahajan of Nakoli, on some offenders of Gamra, being proved to have been concerned in the case, the Salumbar authorities, as well as the Mehkma Khas, were requested to arrange for the arrest of the offenders. In reply, a copy of a communication from the Foujdar and Kamdar of Salumbar was received under the order of the Mehkma Khas, No. 9906, dated 1st Chait Budi 8th, Sambat 1944, to the effect that the offenders are unmanageable and that the Pal should be punished. But no action was taken to produce and punish the culprits. The villagers of the said Pal began to commit crimes in all directions and ravaged the country. Complaints of the depredations being received from every quarter, a statement of 28 cases was, on Bhadon Sudi 6th, Sambat 1947, forwarded to the Foujdar and Kamdar of Salumbar, who were addressed to the effect that, in spite of repeated requests, neither had the criminals been produced nor any action taken by the estate to provide them with seed (*takkavi*) for cultivation, which would prevent them from committing depredations, and that steps may now be taken in the matter and the offenders produced, failing which, suitable action would be taken" (by the State). "During the famine of Sambat 1956, when guards were sent in the districts for the protection of the people, 2 guards were stationed at Methuri. The *badmashes* of this Pal stole two bullocks of Barji Rajput of Methuri. The guards followed the tracks to Mukarsima where they were informed by Nanjira chowkidar that the bullocks were carried away by the villagers of Gamra. The guards proceeded, accompanied by Nanjira, and stopped for the night in the Khalsa village of Kaduni. The *badmashes* of the Pal of Gamra committed a raid during the night and cut and carried away the standing crops of Kaduni. A party of the villagers started (in search of the *badmashes*) accompanied by the guards, who traced and followed the foot-prints. The party was, however, left behind, and the guards followed the tracks which ended at the house of Tejira Bhil of Gamra, who was found in possession of the stolen crops. But the people of the Pal came in a body, shot arrows and fired guns. The guards had an encounter with them and as they were smaller in number, they left the place to save their lives. It is not known by whom one of the accused (Megla) was shot dead. Far from preventing crimes, the Foujdar and Kamdar of Salumbar, on the contrary, made a lengthy report of 4 pages to the Mehkma Khas complaining against the Tehsildar of Methuri. The Tehsildar was called on for a report and his explanation was submitted to the Mehkma Khas on Mangsar Budi 6th, Sambat 1957. A statement of 45 crimes committed by the *badmashes*

Serial No. 1] Grieves of the Rawat of Salumbar against Mewar.

of the Pal of Gamra was submitted by the Tehsildar and it was forwarded to the Mehkma Khas with a report, dated, Pos Sudi 5th. The Mehkma Khas asked the Foujdar and Kamdar of Salumbar to take measures to prevent the commission of crimes by the *badmashes* of the Pal of Gamra, and addressed them to the effect that, as the estate had failed to take proper steps in the matter, and the people had repeatedly been committing crimes, the State will now take necessary measures. Intimation of the action taken by the Mehkma Khas was communicated to this office in a rukka, No. 3001. The *badmashes* of Gamra again committed crimes in Birpura and other villages and intimation was sent to the Mehkma Khas. In reply, a rukka, No. 3681, was received from the Mehkma Khas, stating that a guard may be posted in Birpura and a report submitted after a few days. In compliance with this, another report was submitted of the mischief done by these *badmashes*. In the meanwhile, on receipt, with the Mehkma Khas endorsement No. 3423, of a copy of a communication from the Foujdar and Kamdar of Korabar regarding the excesses committed by the Bhils of Gamra, the Tehsildar of Methuri was asked to submit a report and, on its receipt, a copy of it was forwarded to the Mehkma Khas. Since, in spite of so much correspondence and repeated requests made by the Mehkma Khas to the Foujdar and Kamdar of Salumbar, no action was taken to suppress the Bhils of the Pal, the State was forced to punish them for the safety of the people. When the Pal was punished, 2 Phallas which were situated at some distance from the Pal escaped punishment. These again began to indulge in crime, which fact was reported to the Mehkma Khas on Sawan Budi 10th, Sambat 1959. The Mehkma Khas addressed the Foujdar and Kamdar of Salumbar to the effect that there were many complaints against the villagers of Gamra, that, as they (Foujdar and Kamdar) failed, either to take preventive measures or inflict punishment in spite of repeated injunctions, they should not now fail to take effective measures in respect to the 2 Phallas, against which there were many complaints, and that, failing to do so, proper orders will be issued for inflicting punishment on the Pal. Intimation of the above was conveyed in this office Parwana No. 4587. The Foujdar and Kamdar of Salumbar stated in their reply, a copy of which was furnished to this office with Mehkma Khas endorsement No. 616, that repeated complaints being received against the Bhils of Gamra, the Mehkma Khas were, in a communication No. 3257, dated Baisakh Budi 9th, Sambat 1957, asked for permission to chastise the Pal, but that no reply was received to it, that the Hakim of Magra, without asking them to join him, marched troops direct, on Asadh Budi 3rd, Sambat 1957, punished the *badmashes* and destroyed the Pal. It was well that the *badmashes* were punished, as they deserved punishment, but it was contrary to the usual procedure to inflict punishment without co-operation of the estate. As the Magra Hakim was not accompanied by any official of the estate, the cattle belonging to persons who had sent them to the Pal for grazing were also taken away, with those belonging to the Pal, and that these persons were claiming for the restoration of their cattle. A copy of the Salumbar communication was sent to the Tehsildar of Methuri for report."

"NOTE.—The cattle found at the time of punishing the Pal were for a long time kept in the court, and it was notified to the public that, if any of the cattle belong to a person other than a Bhil, he may, on production of proof in the Court, take his animals back. Notwithstanding the fact that a long time was allowed, no claimant appeared for the cattle."

"Subsequently, on Asoj Budi 10th, Sambat 1959, the Foujdar and Kamdar of Salumbar stated that control was exercised by means of patrols and outposts, and requested that the Assamies who had left may be directed to re-settle in their original village. In reply to this the Tehsildar of Methuri wrote to say that Bayam Padam Singh, who had been posted at Gamra, received one-fourth of the property obtained by plunder in several cases, and that he also receives one-fourth (Chouthan) from the complainants; that it was difficult to expect him to make any arrangements and that it was feared that crimes would tend to increase day by day. This was communicated to the Mehkma Khas. In the same connection a communication was received from the Foujdar and Kamdar of Korabar, with Mehkma Khas endorsement No. 3438, in which they stated that gangs of the villagers of Gamra, patta Salumbar, go about at unusual hours and commit crimes and requested that measures may be taken about this. A report was accordingly submitted to the Mehkma Khas stating that, unless the villagers of Gamra are punished, there was no hope of

maintaining order. Previously, when Gamra was punished, 2 Phallas escaped punishment. It was therefore requested that orders may be issued to punish them as there were many complaints against them from all sides. On this, the Mehkma Bala addressed the Salumbar authorities to the effect that previously the villagers of Gamra were punished for committing crimes and that as there were again complaints against them, measures may be taken to repress them or that punishment would again be inflicted on the Pal. At the same time a rukka No. 404, dated Sawan Budi 8th, Sambat 1931, was received in this office which directed that if the crimes are not prevented, the fact may be reported later on. After this a communication was received from the Foujdar and Kamdar of Salumbar with Mehmeh Khas endorsement No. 809, dated Sawan Budi 13th, Sambat 1931, to the effect that a Thana has been stationed at Gamra, that it is probable that the perpetrators of the crimes are those persons who left Gamra at the time punishment was inflicted on the Pal, and settled in Khalsa and other Jagir villages and who are still known to belong to Gamra and that if the Korabar authorities have any ground for complaint against the villagers of Gamra they may bring regular charges against them. In reply, the Court submitted a report, intimating that the statement made by the Salumbar authorities is not correct, and that the whole blame lies upon the villagers of Gamra. The Court added that when any of the villages of patta Korabar make a complaint against Gamra, the Salumbar authorities ask that a regular charge may be preferred. When the Salumbar authorities, in spite of repeated calls, do not produce their assamies what benefit can be expected from the complainants preferring their claim. The accused of Gamra, putti Salumbar, committed burglary and carried away property of Nandi Dagi of Gudel, patta Korabar. The Court requested that arrangements may be made for the production of the accused. A rukka was received that a dhons of one Sowar may be sent to Salumbar. The Salumbar authorities did not, however, produce their assamies for trial but made a false report to the Mehmeh Bala, stating that they had produced the assamies, and thus got the dhons withdrawn. A rukka was then received enquiring whether the assamies were produced, as stated by Salumbar."

"NOTE.—The Salumbar authorities deceived the Mehmeh Khas and, by making a false report, got the dhons withdrawn. A report was accordingly made that no assamies were produced by Salumbar."

"A communication was received from the Foujdar and Kamdar complaining against the Bhils of the Pal of Gamra for committing raids. A copy of it was forwarded to the Tehsildar of Methuri who confirmed the complaint and stated that the villagers of Gamra have, as already reported, recently committed 4 or 5 depredations in Methuri. The Tehsildar added that the thanas posted at Gamra by Salumbar cannot be expected to prevent the villagers of the Pal from committing incursions. The Mehmeh Khas was therefore moved, in a report dated Sawan budi 5, Sambat 1931, to take measures to prevent the recurrence of the crimes, on which a dem-official rukha No. 624 was received, calling for a statement of raids committed by the Bhils of Gamra. A statement of 79 cases, in which claims were preferred and which were committed in the Magra district, was therefore forwarded, with the remark that the statement showed only those cases in which claims were preferred, and that, in addition to them, there were numerous cases of raids committed by the villagers of Gamra."

"NOTE.—The file regarding the disposal of the cattle, etc., found after punishing the Pal has been submitted to the Mehmeh Khas and has not yet been returned"

7. Paragraph 13 of the Kharita reads:—"The boundaries of this estate are co-terminous with those of Banswara, Partabgarh and Dungarpur States. Every now and then, there occur cases between the estate and the above States. Any disputes that arise between the estate and any of the above States are settled mutually and only such disputes that cannot be settled amicably between the parties concerned are brought before the Border Courts. But now we are forced to stop amicable settlement of the disputes (*vide* the Mehmeh Khas letter on the subject) which is quite detrimental to the interests of our subjects. The old practice is that the *prima facie* papers of the cases, that are to be brought before the Border Courts, which are received from alien States are passed on to the estate for necessary action. This practice is now discontinued, the *prima facie* papers are not passed on to the estate, and the surrender of the assamies is demanded from us. In view of the fact that the estate has power to dispose of Civil and Criminal cases, there is no reason why the old practice should be abandoned and the Salumbar assamies should suffer through ignorance of the *prima facie* papers."

8. To this complaint the Darbar reply that old custom has not been contravened, except when, through contumacy of the Rawat, it becomes necessary, in the interests of justice and

## Serial No. 1] Grievances of the Rawat of Salumbar against Mewar.

in the discharge of Mewar's obligations to a bordering State and the paramount power to intervene. In all such border cases, there are two Salumbar Mota-nids present, but, though the *prima facie* papers are communicated to the Rawat, Mewar has to take steps, if this is not done by Salumbar (as is often the case) to secure the attendance of parties. The Darbar assert that Salumbar agreed to the procedure (laid down in Sambat 1949) for the trial of border court cases.

9. My impression is that, while the Darbar officials probably do not hesitate to encroach on the Patta's prerogatives, the Rawatji, by his sullen resistance to legitimate enquiries, has so prejudiced his case that the Darbar, especially in regard to matters with which other States are concerned, are justified in the degree of intervention which appears to have taken place. As to this matter, and other minor complaints, it will be necessary to sum up, generally, further on.

10. Paragraph 14 of the Kharita reads as follows:—"The Foujdar and Kimalir of the estate have since long time past enjoyed exemption from attending the Courts of the State, so that, when a reference to them was necessary, it used to be made by correspondence or interrogatories. But now, their attendance is insisted upon, and on protesting against the procedure the Darbar send a dhons to the estate. A statement of Dhons is attached herewith."

The Darbar admits that, on special occasions, the Foujdar and Kandar have been asked to appear in person in troublesome cases in which their evidence has been necessary. Statements for the years 1948 and 1949, put in by the Darbar, record three occasions in each year. I did not ask the Darbar for more recent data, since this is such a trumpery matter, and, if other issues are settled it will not of itself form a grievance.

11. Paragraph 15 of Kharita complains that:—"During the time of Rawat Padam Singhji the Darbar confiscated some of the villages of the estate, some of which were subsequently restored to us by Mr. Cobbe, as will be seen from the List No. 4, enclosed herewith. Of the villages confiscated only those that were under the Khalsa management were restored to us but two of them, viz., Barodia and Parla, which the Darbar had granted in jagir to other persons, have not been restored to us till now. We are only told that the persons will be given other villages in jagir and that our own villages will be returned to us, which has not been done up to this day. We, therefore, request that the villages may be returned to us and their revenues for the time that we have been deprived of their possession may be granted us."

"Mr. Cobbe" of course could not, and in point of fact did not, promise that the villages which, confiscated from Salumbar, had been granted to others, should be restored. What he did was to communicate the fact that the Darbar intended to restore to Khalsa villages. The Darbar denies that Salumbar was "told that the persons will be given other villages in

Salumbar has failed to produce copy of this jagir and that our own villages will be returned to us." These villages were confiscated 100 years ago, and, as an act of grace, those which had

remained Khalsa were restored. But there is no "right" on Salumbar's part, and the Darbar has never had, nor has at present, any intention of restoring them.

12. Paragraph 16 summarizes the complaints. It reads as follows:—"From what I have stated above, you will see to what extent our rights have been encroached upon, to what unnecessary losses we have been put, and how our subjects have been ruined, and how heavily, as well as my subjects, have suffered and are still suffering. All these troubles are due to the reasons enumerated above. You are an experienced officer and know how scrupulously old customs, and rights affecting dignity, are maintained in Rajputana. My request is not unreasonable. What I pray for is that the Darbar should abide by the same procedure and accord the same treatment as prevailed from the time of Chandaji to Rawat Jodh Singhji's time, and that the Darbar should honour my thikana with a visit. It is only a matter of that the estate is at present harassed by sending Dhons of 10 Sowars and four Sepoys and that the rabi produce of Sambat 1962 of the Rund and Odwadia has been looted; villages have been ruined by fields not being irrigated. The amount due to us on account of salt and Dakaities are committed on our villages. Justice is not done. Boundary disputes are got up and the lands which we have been possessed for generations are forcibly resumed; our subjects

are fined without fault; our appeals are not heard; new (bahanas) false subterfuges are made and the Hakims of the State, Courts without considering the rank and dignity of the estate, impose fines without reason and try to take from us our powers.

"We therefore request that you will be kind enough to do us justice in all the (above) "matter and grant us compensation."

13. The Darbar draws attention to expressions such as "loit" and "bahana" (false pretexts), which are objected to as most improper and as indicating a most unbecoming attitude. In further evidence of this spirit of insubordination the Darbar produced several papers of 1963 (a month or so ago) in which Salumbar describe themselves as "Sri Darbar," while it also has taken to issuing parwanas (in the above style addressed to Khalsa village). These points require mention because they, as well as others which have gone before and will follow have produced in His Highness' mind a feeling of exasperation which would have rendered most difficult the task of securing any compromise had the merits of the case pointed to compromise.

14. B.—*Darbars' Complaints*—After completion of the enquiry into the actual allegations contained in Salumbar's Kharita, His Highness asked me to allow him to show me a few instances, of the many recorded with him, which in his opinion indicated his extreme moderation in the face of the gravest provocation—

(a) Salumbar complained of the imposition of dhons. The records show there are 10 sowars and 4 foot-soldiers imposed on Salumbar at present.

The records of eight out of twenty-three cases of the past four or five years, were read out to me. They are chiefly cases in which murder or other serious crime has occurred, in which Salumbar has been implicated; in which the Rawat has been addressed but has declined to reply, or has written refusing either information or assistance. There is also one case in which the payment of a fine, imposed for breach of Walterkrit rules, has been refused. In one case, at least, of dakaati of sorts—which occurred when His Highness was at Jaisamand an effort to arrive at justice through diplomatic means was thwarted by Salumbar's obstinate refusal to help. Salig Ramji (at present at Nathdwara) was sent personally by His Highness to endeavour to get matters settled. Other cases were in connection with wrongful collection of opium duty by Salumbar.

The list of cases is supported by full records, which bear indications of a genuine effort to secure compliance before imposition of the Dhons: and the degree of recusancy would, in His Highness' view, have justified the imposition of a far higher penalty. Salumbar's replies (when vouch-safed) are on the record and are hopelessly rude and uncompromising.

(b) Reverting to paragraph 12 of Salumbar's Kharita which reads as follows:—

"Rs. 3,000 Chitor, on account of compensation for the customs collection of the Sawa village and Imperial Rs. 725 on account of salt compensation, are payable to the estate by the Darbar. But the former amount remains unpaid since the Sambat year 1957, and the latter since the year 1958. The list showing amounts due to the estate under these heads is enclosed."

His Highness produced before me a report from the Customs Officer at Chitor, dated Sambat 1951, in which it was reported that Salumbar continued collecting customs duty at

I have inspected the whole correspondence in Sawa. This report was forwarded to Salumbar this case, for report and with a request that orders might be issued to stop this irregularity. Salumbar

reported that orders had issued. But collections continued, at steadily increasing rates, of which a detailed statement, drawn up by the Customs Officer, is attached (Appendix S). It will be observed that corn, too, is subject to an import, though exempt in Mewar.

A further record was placed before me reporting of similar illegal exactations of *dan* at Manpur, near the Dungarpur border.

I have enquired whether Salumbar has again been addressed on the subject recently and the Darbar will let me know.

(c) His Highness then asked me if I would look into some of the 209 cases in which Salumbar had, since the accession of the present Rawat, either failed to answer references, dispose of cases, or carry out orders. I examined so *as at random*.

## Serial No. 1] Grievances of the Rawat of Salumbar against Mewar.

One was a case of murder, in which there is reason to believe that no enquiry has been made (I received a complaint while in Salumbar from the son of a man who had disappeared; this is probably the same case).

Another was of wrongful imprisonment of a co-complainant and witness in a case which was never enquired into.

Another was a complaint which had been forwarded by the Resident for report.

Some of the 209 cases may be frivolous and vexatious, and designed to annoy Salumbar but the half dozen of which the papers were read out to me appeared to be genuine.

(d) His Highness then made a statement to me. It was to the effect:—

(i) that he knew for a fact that this question of the Matampursi had never been raised before Rawat Kesri Singhji's time (Rani Sarup Singh). There was no mention whatever of it before that date, nor any suggestion that it had ever been debated

This is borne out by the absence of any mention before. He said that he himself would have certainly known about this 'huk' as a young man, was disputed from Tod's time up to then. before he became Mahirana; but he assured me that it was never mooted then.

(ii) that he was not, as had doubtless been suggested to me, anxious to deprive Salumbar of an acre of territory which was justly his; that such fractions would be of no use to him anyway, and that the ruin of Salumbar was not his desire.

## V.—CONCLUSIONS.

Having now dealt fully with each head of this intricate and troublesome case, and having recorded, under each of the three important heads, the opinion formed after balancing the evidence adduced by the contending parties, it only remains to summarise, very briefly, the inference drawn, and then to indicate what seems to me to be the proper course to pursue with a view to effecting a settlement.

2. *As to the Matampursi ceremony.*—It is abundantly clear that, although, owing to the silence of the Darbar for the past fifty-five years, and to the loudly asseverated claims of Salumbar, it came to be believed by the other Sardars, and accepted as an axiom by successive Residents, that it was the practice of successive Ranas to perform the ceremony at Salumbar, the Rawat's claim is based on false documents, and is unsupported by any shred of valid testimony, save only the facts that on two occasions the Rana did proceed to Salumbar. Those were both special occasions, whereas there is no record of any value as to the admission of Salumbar's right, or as to the practice, on any single normal occasion. *Per contra* there is a good deal of reasonably reliable evidence showing that in ordinary circumstances, it is the

(1) the Patta Bahi. practice for the Mahiraj Kunwar to go to Salumbar for the performance of the ceremony. I have  
(2) Kesri Singh's letter.  
(3) Instances on record.

traced in the State records bearing upon this question other than those he has shown me.

3. Under this head, therefore, I find after devoting three days at Salumbar to the inspection of every title of evidence that could be produced, and many days with the Mahirana in going through the State records, that the Rawat's claim to be Matampursid at Salumbar by His Highness cannot be sustained. I believe that the present Rawat is innocent of the forgeries upon which his case rests, and that he really believed that the documents were genuine. The claim was never made before A. D. 1847 or thereabouts, and I have no doubt that Rawat Kesri Singh—the notorious and arrogant opponent of the Raj's rights—was the person who instigated the forgeries. Consequently, the blame attaching to the use of forged documents does not rest with the present Rawat (who is, indeed, entitled to a certain sympathy as being the victim of his fraudulent predecessors).

4. *Alleged infringement by the Darbar on Salumbar's judicial, etc., authority.*—My conclusion is that Salumbar possesses, as of right, no special criminal or civil powers not recognised as common to other first class Jagirdars: on the question whether any such special powers have been customarily exercised or should be now conferred, I do not think it is necessary to touch at present. Much will depend upon the Rawat's attitude hereafter.

5. *The settlement of the Run dispute* is not one for the Resident, but for the Boundary Settlement Officer; and all that it is necessary to record here is, that Salumbar has failed

**Grievances of the Rawat of Salumbar against Mewar. [Serial No. 1**

to make out a case of such tyrannous encroachment as would justify intervention by us while his claim to the whole Run rests on a forgery.

6. *Minor complaints.*—To each grievance of Salumbar the Maharana has at least one countervailing complaint. It is neither necessary nor desirable to adjudicate upon them, or intervene officially with a view to their settlement in detail. They will, for the most part, settle themselves when the main issue is decided.

7 *Recommendations*—Since Salumbar's official protest has come before the Resident that officer has incurred a certain responsibility for the decision. There are other considerations, too, which cannot be ignored. For example, partly owing to the dominance of the Nobles in Rana Shimbha Singh's time, and to the action then taken with the boy Rana, and partly on account of the re-iterated acceptance by successive Residents of Salumbar's contention, the other Sardars of Mewar undoubtedly incline to the view that the Maharanas should go to Salumbar to perform the *Matampur* ceremony. Such being the case, I think that the Residency has a certain responsibility both to the Darbar and to Salumbar and the other Nobles in the matter. It will not, therefore, suffice to tell His Highness that, since he has demonstrated the falsity of Salumbar's main contention, he can do as he pleases, and that no further action will be taken on Salumbar's behalf.

8. We have openly, in the past, expressed the opinion that the Maharana was in the wrong; and His Highness is therefore entitled to explicit support in his recision. In view of our past attitude, too, we must see that the justice of the decision is explained to the Nobles. Further our responsibility to Salumbar demands that the Resident should personally explain the invalidity of his claim, and advise him as to his future course of action.

That which requires earliest disposal is the last named. I propose, therefore, to invite the Rawat (conforming my action to His Highness' views) to come to see me, and personally to tell him of the decision come to by me after the exhaustive enquiry made; explaining the forgeries on which his claim rests. I propose advising him to make absolute and complete submission to His Highness leaving the subsequent decision on other matters to the Maharana, who I hope will, in his own interests, consent to consult me.

In pursuance of my responsibility to His Highness, I propose communicating to him a Khat, intimating as shortly as possible, that, after an exhaustive examination of the record at Salumbar and Udaipur, I have found—

- (a) that the two main documents relied on by Salumbar are proved by internal evidence, to be undoubted forgeries,
- (b) that there is no record prior to 1847 of any claim to the special *Matampur* ceremony,
- (c) that it has only been proved that the Maharana performed the ceremony himself at Salumbar on two occasions (to be specified) on both of which there were special circumstances which deprive them of value as precedents;
- (d) that, *per contra*, the Darbar records, though not as conclusive as they might be admit that the Maharaj Kunwar shou'd go to Salumbar for this purpose and that these are supported by Kesri Singh's letter (Exhibit D).

I propose to add (a), that in these circumstances, provided Salumbar absolutely, and without reservation, withdraws his pretensions under this head, His Highness will, I hope, see his way to deputing the Maharaj Kunwar, as soon as possible, to Salumbar for the *Matampur* ceremony; also (b), that in view of the possibility that His Highness' decision in this matter may, in view of past occurrences, be subject for surprise or misunderstanding on the part of the other Sardars, it would be well perhaps that this Khat should be communicated to the other 16 Nobles, together with, if His Highness pleases, an explanatory memorandum, which might be drawn up under His Highness' orders, indicating the proofs as to the forgeries.

(Sd.) C. H. HILL,  
Resident, Mewar.

Serial No. 2] Grievances of the Rawat of Salumbar against Mewar.

## 2

No. 373-C. of 1908, dated Camp, the 9th February 1908.

From—C. C. Watson, Esq., I.C.S., First Assistant to the Agent to the Governor-General, Rajputana,  
To—C. H. A. Hill, Esq., C.I.E., Resident, Mewar.

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No. 465, dated  
Serial No. 1. the 23rd December 1906, and of its enclo-  
sures regarding the Salumbar *Matampursi* case.

2. In reply, I am to say that after going carefully through all the papers forwarded with your letter, it undoubtedly appears to the Hon'ble the Agent to the Governor-General to be proved by the results of recent historical research that the evidence on which the Rawat of Salumbar bases his claim to receive *Matampursi* from His Highness the Maharana himself at Salumbar cannot be genuine; and it appears that a similar claim made in the time of Maharana Sarup Singh was supported by entirely different documentary evidence, which had to be rejected on the same ground.

3. The evidence both for and against the alleged custom appears to be of a very fragmentary description, and the Hon'ble Mr. Colvin is glad to learn that the Rawat has now agreed to accept the view of His Highness the Maharana in the matter, which is that the *Matampursi* should be done at Salumbar by the Heir-apparent and not by the Chief himself. The case is one which really concerns His Highness the Maharana only, being a matter of internal administration, but since previous Political Officers have been compelled by circumstances to give opinions in the matter, it is naturally one in which the Political authorities are still interested, and His Highness the Maharana's freedom of action has perhaps been somewhat hampered in the past by the fact that the whole weight of political opinion was against him. You however have, Mr. Colvin understands, fully satisfied yourself that the position taken by His Highness the Maharana in the case ever since the time of Maharana Sarup Singh is fully justified, and that the opinion of previous Political Officers, being based, rather on general assumption than on a critical examination of the evidence and of the historical accuracy of the claim, must now be abandoned.

4. In Mr. Colvin's opinion, it would have been more satisfactory if some direct evidence could have been produced as to what procedure actually took place in the case of the *Matampursi* ceremony for the Rawats between Kunwar Singh and Padam Singh. But he understands from you that nothing can be found to substantiate conclusions arrived at by Captain Brooke and reported in his letter No. 12 of 14th February 1853, and that the records of any enquiry, which may have been made at that time, are not now traceable in your office. It may safely be assumed that the Kawat of Salumbar would have produced in support of his claim any direct proofs possessed by him on this subject, and on the other hand, we have the assurance of His Highness the Maharana that no documents bearing on the point have been found in the State records other than those which have been produced by him. Since then there is no further evidence forthcoming on either side, and since the present Rawat has settled the difficulty by asking that the Maharaj Kunwar may visit him Mr. Colvin sees no reason to question that settlement of the matter.

5. As regards the other questions involved, it does not seem necessary for Mr. Colvin to express any opinion at this stage, but he sincerely trusts that the main question having been settled, both sides will approach them in a conciliatory spirit and that a mutual arrangement will be arrived at. His Highness the Maharana, having succeeded in his contention, on the main issue, will no doubt be disposed to meet the Salumbar Rawat's reasonable requests in a liberal spirit in minor matters.

6. The Hon'ble the Agent to the Governor-General greatly appreciates the frank and open way in which His Highness the Maharana has discussed the whole case with you, and he is glad to learn that His Highness has expressed his readiness to send the Maharaj Kunwar to Salumbar for the *Matampursi* ceremony without delay.

7. Mr. Colvin concurs with you that it is necessary to explain carefully to the principal Mewar Sardars the reasons which have led to the recent change of view taken by the political authorities in this matter. You will no doubt yourself take any opportunity that may offer, of verbally explaining the circumstances to as many of them as possible. In his opinion there is no objection to the communication to them of the purport of the *Khat* to be addressed by you to the Rawat, so far as it relates to the *Matampursi* question, but this should, of course, only be done through the Mewar Darbar.

## 3

No. 55, dated Salumbar, the 19th April 1910.

From—RAWAT ONAR SINGH of Salumbar,

To—The HON'BLE MR. E. G. COLVIN, C.S.I., Agent to the Governor-General for Rajputana.

In continuation of my letter No. 30, dated the 12th January 1910, I beg to submit herewith, for your good self's consideration, Parts III, IV and V of Serial No. 3, Judicial Powers, etc. the Thikana Representation regarding (1), Customs and Salt Compensation, (2) Sasnik villages and the village of Para, and (3) Certain miscellaneous rights and privileges of the Salumbar Thikana and hope that the same would be vouchsafed early and favourable attention.

## 4

No. 131-C, dated Mount Abu, the 21st May 1910.

*Endorsed by the First Assistant to the Agent to the Governor-General in Rajputana.*

Forwarded to the Resident, Mewar, to whom the petitions should have been submitted in the first instance. The Resident is requested kindly to favour the Hon'ble the Agent to the Governor-General with his remarks and opinion on the grievances of the Rawat.

## 5

No. 58, dated Salumbar, the 10th May 1910.

From—RAWAT ONAR SINGH of Salumbar,

To—The HON'BLE MR. E. G. COLVIN, C.S.I., Agent to the Governor-General in Rajputana, Mount Abu.

Being totally disappointed in my repeated endeavour to conciliate my subordinate Jagirdars, whose insubordination has been reported to Your Honour from time to time and who have hitherto resisted all my said overtures, I have at last taken the liberty to bring the following to Your Honour's kind notice and to request that a sympathetic consideration of the same would not only relieve the Thikana of a distressing embarrassment but would confer a lasting salvation upon those innocent but none the less oppressed Rajputs and other Rayots of the Thikana who are helpless victims of their tyrannical raids.

1. The following Jagirdars, namely, Kesri Singh of Isarwas, Chandan Singh of Dholpura, Rughnath Singh of Bhimpura, Zorawar Singh and Ratan Singh of Jamura and Kharwar Padam Singh, Bajnot Bhopal Singh and Mukand Singh, etc., of Salumbar, throwing off since long their

## Serial No. 5] Grievances of the Rawat of Salumbar against Mewar.

allegiance, have forcibly possessed themselves of a good many villages belonging to the Thikana and those of other loyal Jagirdars. They have neglected to carry out their dutifull obligations towards the Thikana. Moreover, they stand charged with committing assault and injury to the Thikana officials; thus wilfully preventing the latter from discharging their duties. And when the Thikana Courts, in pursuance of complaints preferred by the Thikana Rayots institute proceedings against them, they do not mind them, which, besides causing the Thikana a considerable loss of annual revenue, deprives the other Jagirdars of their incomes, owing to which they starve: to say nothing of the wrong thus done to the poor Rayots.

2. Often the employés of Tehsil Methuri join these Jagirdars in their incursions. As to the letter they always remain with the Tehsildar, Methuri and those proceedings which ought to have been instituted in the Thikana are dealt with directly at the said Tehsil which clearly shows that they are encouraged in their refractoriness by the said Tehsildar and Magra.

3. Although these Jagirdars have left no means unused of ruining and devastating the villages of the Thikana and of other Jagirdars and also of violating the cherished rights of the Thikana Rayots, yet I have hitherto taken strict care to advise nothing but patience to the unfortunate sufferers rather than the application of physical force.

4. The Rajeshri Mahkama Khas being approached twice or thrice with the prayer that these Jagirdars should not be encouraged, as they have been hitherto done, by the Tehsildar, Methuri and that a notice be issued interdicting every one from associating with these recusants. But, unfortunately, no action seems to have been taken in the matter by the State authorities and consequently all conciliatory measures have been doomed to disappointment.

Since Salumbar subjects are highly harrassed by these Jagirdars and since they unduly interfere with the income and communal ceremonies of a group of respectable persons there is every probability of a serious occurrence taking place some day or other. Regarding the Thikana, how long can it be expected to put up patiently with these losses and ever-recurring public disorders. I have ever regarded Shri Darbar as my master and liege Lord and as such I am fully confident of his kind sympathy and support in the above matter. But the Magra Zila has made it a point to conceal the true facts from its superiors, which all the more eggs them in their defiance and the Thikana, in its turn loses all hopes of receiving justice. Under the circumstances, I would request your honour that any how this painful question be kindly effectively dealt with. But as a preliminary step to this end, it is highly essential that no Khalsa official should ever associate with this obnoxious party and that a proclamation be published prohibiting any one from giving them shelter or support. It should also be notified to them through Magra in unmistakeable words that Salumbar is fully entitled to compel them in discharging their obligations towards the Thikana. Also if circumstances require the State officials should give necessary help to Salumbar in successfully combating the above evil. But none of my above entreaties were considered favourably by the Mahkma Khas. At last, now I have moved the Resident, Mewar, in the above matter requesting him that I have already submitted my above case to his consideration and that I shall submit more papers as occasions shall call forth, lastly, that the Mahkma Khas be asked to vouchsafe due consideration over the matter. I have every hope that the said Mahkma will bestow full and sympathetic consideration on the above case. If Your Honour should also be kind enough to ask the Resident, Mewar, to direct the State that the latter should give the Thikana every possible help in the above matter, I hope I shall in no time succeed in securing its speedy settlement.

Apologising for this trouble and trusting this will find you in the enjoyment of sound health.

## 6

No. 206-P., dated Rajputana Agency, Mount Abu, the 14th June 1910.

Delivered by the First Assistant to the Agent to the Governor-General in Rajputana.

Forwarded\* to the Resident, Mewar, for such action as he may deem proper

\*To be kindly returned.

Serial No. 4.

Letter No. 52, dated the 10th May 1910, from  
F. S. Ober Singh of Salumbar. (Serial No. 5).

with a request that these complaints also may be dealt with in the reply to this office endorsement No. 131-C., dated the 21st May 1910.

Letter No. 68, dated Salumbar, Mewar, the 3rd July 1910.

From—The RAWAT OF SALUMBAR, Mewar,  
To—The Agent to the Governor-General, Rajputana.

Not long ago, I had submitted the main points of my case to Your Honour's kind consideration under 5 heads, a perusal of which would have revealed the true condition of my embarrassments. Though not insensible to the fact that its decision would require time, I have full hopes that it would be vouchsafed early and favourable consideration at your Honour's kind hands.

Notwithstanding has to face daily new calamities in that my rayats are beaten and harrassed by the Sarara Zilla; the Thikana's share of the produce is seized; the cultivators and their live-stock have altogether been deprived of their means of subsistence; Jagirdars owning subordination to me have become so mutinous and refractory as to carry away fearlessly the grain produce being the revenue of my villages and the Tehsil Mehturi, against all precedent, deals directly with them which serves additional spurs their insubordination.

It is a rule that when a superior oppresses his subordinate, the latter appeals to the higher authorities and so long as the points in dispute remain *sub judice*, arrangements are favoured restoring the *status quo ante*. But my Thikana appears to be highly unlucky in being hitherto deprived of this privilege in as much as the Dhonses have not been withdrawn; the Jaisamand Rur has been annexed into the Khalsa; though irrigation has been prohibited yet now-a-days the water-tix is, forcibly recovered by harrassing the Zamindars; the revenues of the villages of Orwaria, Deoli, Heekawârâ and Khummanpura have been attached; the rebellious Jagirdars have been taking off by sheer dacoity the bhog of Amalwâ Namla Bora, Baran Sutaria, Jaipura and divers other stray pieces of land, nay, these have even been emboldened to go the length of remaining a prisoner by breking open the jail and then to raid and plunder the Thana of Ganiâ and, lastly the Thikana Asamis, are, in contravention of old procedure summoned directly which have now created a state of perfect helplessness in my Thikana.

Moreover, a new difficulty has of late, cropped up seeing that now-a-days the Mahkma Khas without vouchsafing any reasons for its strange conduct refuses to receive the papers submitted to it, as replies or communications, on behalf of the Thikana. This besides exposing the Thikana to a severe loss, is likely to be construed into non-compliance with state's orders. Thereupon these papers were forwarded in original to the Resident, Mewar. But unfortunately for the Thikana, this upright and just officer also returned them and expressing his inability to take any steps in the matter, ordered me to move the Mahkma Khas when both the Mahkma Khas and the Residency do not vouchsafe due attention to my representations whom else should I pray? Under the circumstances, my critical condition and the sympathies of the Mahkma Khas and the Residency with my troubles deserve Your Honours consideration.

Shri Darbar being my Master and Liege-lord, I have tried all legible means to secure His Highness' good will and mercy and am still doing so. I cherish no ill-will. inasmuch as I seek redress only in matters affecting my livelihood and hereditary dignity. But unfortunately, no relief has come as yet. Thus I am compelled to trouble Your Honour with repeated reques that I may be soon favoured with your far-famed justice as my troubles have now become practically unbearable.

Trusting this will find you in the enjoyment of good health.

No. 2759, dated Rajputana Agency Office, Abu, the 20th July 1910.

Endorsed by the First Assistant to the Agent to the Governor-General, Rajputana

Forwarded to the Resident, Mewar, in continuation of the correspondence ending with this office No. 267-P., dated

Serial No. 9.

Letter dated the 3rd July 1910, from the 9th July 1910.  
Rawat of Salumbar (Serial No. 7).

Serial No. 9] Grievances of the Rawat of Salumber against Mewar.

## 9

Letter No. 1, dated Salumber Mewar, the 29th July 1910.

From—RAWAT ONAR SINGH of Salumber, Mewar,  
To—The Agent to the Governor-General, Rajputana.

Inviting Your Honour's kind reference to my letter dated the 1st June 1910, regarding the assault made by Padam Singh etc., refractory Jagirdars of this Thikana, on the Thikana Sipahis stationed at Thana Gamra, the arrest of one Chokhla accused and the latter's release through sheer force by the said Jagirdars from the Thana Jail, accompanied with robbery by dacoity, of the Thikana money and the belongings of the said sipahis by these Sirdars, etc, etc, respectfully beg to submit the following new occurrences for Your Honour's information and proper arrangements.

2. Through my letter No. 566, dated the 28th May 1910, I had informed the Rajeshri Mahkma Khas of the disturbance of the public peace which this serious occurrence had created. But apart from vouchsafing a sympathetic consideration, the said Mahkma did not even accept the above letter on the ground that the Thikana was not entitled to write wordings like "Jail" (Jail) and "Thana" (outpost). Thereupon the said Mahkma was again approached, through letter No. 604, dated the 21st June 1910, with the prayer that the Thikana had used only those wordings which had been in vogue since ancient times. Nevertheless this too was rejected. Eventually it was forwarded to the Residency, Mewar. Under these circumstances, I beg Your Honour to judge how I am to change these wordings.

3. Instead of helping the Thikana to bring some this charge of dacoity and assault to the criminals and to mete out proper punishments to these mutinous Sirdars, the Magra Zilla, on the other hand, concocted a new version of the case. In other words, those persons who were appointed by the Thikana at Thana Gamra for capturing Chokhla, an accused,—who was accordingly arrested by them—are alleged by Girdiwar Laxmi Narain to be criminals charged with robbing the house of Padam Singh, one of the refractory Sirdars, of all its moveable property and are consequently required to be handed over to the said Girdiwar. It is a pity that when the Thikana submits petitions to the Mahkma Khas these are not only rejected but are made by the Magra officials, against past practice and precedent, the occasion of attaching quite an undue importance up in the false and frivolous claims of these refractory Jagirdars and thus unduly emboldening them in their defiance.

4. These irregular proceedings, while investing the refractory movements of these Sirdars with an undue prominence in the uneducated eyes of the public, injuriously affect the status of the Thikana in matters relating to its administration and go to impair the strong hold which it must exercise upon the convictions of the rayats.

5. Therefore, in conclusion, I humbly beg Your Honour to bestow due consideration upon these representations and favour me with a sympathetic reply, for which kindness I shall feel highly thankful.

Trusting this will find Your Honour in the enjoyment of sound health.

## 10

No. 608—P.-O  
382—II, dated Rajputana Agency Camp, the 9th August 1910.

Endorsed by the First Assistant to the Agent to the Governor-General, Rajputana.

Forwarded to the Resident, Mewar, in continuation of the correspondence

Serial No. 8.  
Letter dated the 29th July 1910, from the Rawat of Salumber (Serial No. 9).  
ending with this office endorsement No. 2759 of 20th July 1910 for favour of report with report on previous petitions.

## 11

No 13, dated Salumbar, Mewar, the 7th October 1910.

From—RAWAT ONAR SINGH of Salumbar,  
To—The Agent to the Governor-General, Rajputana.

Not long ago, I had submitted the main points of my case by way of inviting Your Honour's reconsideration of the findings of the Residency and the Mewar State into my case. A perusal of the above would have revealed to Your Honour the fact that my claims and objections have been treated with scant justice. Now my hopes of getting full justice rests upon Your Honour alone, since, from the day of the institution of my plaint not only all my original grievances continue unredressed but each day brings new calamities which are ruining my Thikana. I am at a loss to know what fault I have committed which goes to account for my being wholly deprived of any sympathy whatsoever in my trouble-some harrassments. As a matter of fact, I had sought redress only in matters relating to my ancient status and dignity and in this also, relying upon the largehearted-liberality and kindness of the State, so very kindly promised to the Thikana by the Residency, I had made great sacrifice by waiving an ancient and most cherished privilege of the Thikana. But unfortunately for the Thikana, no relief has come from the State. The Residency also has shown no sympathy in the Thikana troubles; nay, its findings in the Salumbar case deprive me of my cherished possessions and rights, one after another, which has totally crippled the Thikana revenues, so much so that now my employés are severing their long established connections from the Thikana for want of maintenance.

The following detailed account of my troubles will speak for itself.

- (1) The Run (alluvial soil) of Jaisamand Lake, which has for centuries belonged to Salumbar villages and which, though at first was ordered to be decided by the Boundary Settlement Officer, has been wholly ordered to be annexed to the State Khalsa. This causes the Thikana a loss of the revenues of 15 villages.
- (2) The villages of Nâmlâ, Sâthpur, Robâ, Kherât, Karoriâ situate beyond the Escape Channel (Oota) have been depopulated on account of prohibiting them from using the channel water.
- (3) Formerly the State had claimed that the Thikana is entitled to no judicial powers whatsoever. But this assertion was over-ruled by Mr. C. H. A. Hill, late Resident, Meywar. Nevertheless, the continuance of Dhonses, the passing of fresh orders by the State officials in persuance of its former allegations and the contrivance of diverse other encroachments are a few of the many disabilities the Thikana is at present solely labouring under.
- (4) The payment of customs and salt compensations, which comes to a large amount has been suspended.
- (5) Fresh encroachments have been made by the State in the following Sâsnik villages viz., Todâ, Seriâ, Adkaliâ, Sespur, Samoriâ, Dhairi, Nakhli, Kirakrâ and Bhatwârâ, etc., and Pâlpârâ, which have ever continued in the possession of Salumbar from the very day of its foundation. Besides these, those villages in which the Brahmins own some houses, are also subjected to unwarranted encroachments.
- (6) New disputes being set up, the revenue of a good many villages is seized as, for instance, in the villages of Deoli, Hikârâ, Khummâpûrâ, Orwâria etc. No consideration is paid to the unbroken possession and other pertinent evidence, adduced on behalf of the Thikana, in the shape of old correspondence; nay even new communications are not accepted.
- (7) A permanent relay of Dhonses has been imposed upon the Thikana in the shape of 10 foot and 12 sowars, which in itself tells a heavy burden upon the Thikana.
- (8) When the attendance of a party belonging to Salumbar Patta was required by the Diwani and Faujdari courts, the same was always summoned by writing to the Thikana. Whereas this time-honoured rule has now been replaced by the practice of forcibly arresting the Thikana assamis through Sarârâ and Mehturi people.

(9) Jagidars owning subordination to the Thikana have turned refractory and are encouraged in the same by Tehsil Mehturi and Sarârâ Zilla. Emboldened with this, in addition to the Jagirs already held by them, they have seized a good many of the Thikana villages, *viz.*, Amalwa, Jaipura, Sutharia, Nâmlâ, Bhanor, Baran, etc. Under escort of the Mehturi sowars and foot, they carry away the revenues of these villages. Moreover, lengthening the boundaries of several villages, they have thereby usurped much of the Thikana lands. Neither do they serve the Thikana, nor obey its orders. Furthermore, they reject the Thikana orders and wilfully prevent the arrest of criminals. If an *asâmi*, involved in some offence, is brought in the Thikana, they forcibly set him free by breaking open the jail and become prepared for encounter if checked. Moreover, they even go the length of putting in confinement the *assâmis* of the Thikana villages and subject them to severe beating. The connivance of the tehsil Mehturi and Sarârâ lies at the root of all these excesses. For when the *assâmis* of their villages are dealt with directly, what regard can they have for the Thikana authority? This is why other Jagidars find a ready inducement to rebellion in their bad example and care nothing for the Thikana orders. Thus the party is gaining fresh strength daily and the insubordination occasioned thereby can be better imagined than described.

Compelled by these painful circumstances I had sent my Motmids to wait upon Your Honour at Ajmer. But, unfortunately, they were not favoured with the chance of relating to Your Honour their tale of woe. On the other hand, they were verbally ordered by Your Honour's office to the effect that, until the Residency report was not received, all future representations were to no purpose. Therefore I beg humbly to submit that from a perusal of my case, it would appear that in contradiction with the findings of the Residency, pronounced to the Thikana, the State has issued an order No. 2400, dated 9th August 1919, and is already carrying it into effect, which is a ruinous measure. The objection against the decisions of the late Resident Mewar, Mr. Hill, which I entertained have been brought to your Honour's notice in my Kharita No. 13 of 13th June 1905, which your Honour was pleased to forward to the Residency for consideration. But the only relief favours to the Thikana by State was that which I have pointed out in my reference to the State's order No. 2600. In other words it gives the Thikana a loss of R50,000 a year. And when these orders are being enforced, Your Honour can judge, to what miserable strait I and my Thikana will be reduced to. To ascertain the truthfulness or otherwise of my above statements I request Your Honour to send some responsible person to enquire into my present affairs. I have full hopes that your Honour will do justice unto my case. But every day which passes impairs and undermines the integrity of the Thikana. Thus how long should I exercise patience, Shri Darbar is my Master and Liege-lord and to carry out his orders is my dutiful obligation. But I seek redress only in matters concerning my status and livelihood. And it regrets me to request that no redress has been vouchsafed, as yet. Your Honour is the highest authority in Rajputana and is famed far and wide for even-handed justice. Therefore, whatever justice is to be done in my case it should be vouchsafed early. Also orders should be issued for the effective checking of all future troubles, which alone can save this Thikana from inevitable ruin. Apologising for the trouble;

No. 14, dated Udaipur, the 8th November 1910.

From—RAWAT ONAR SINGH of Salumbar,

To—The HONOURABLE MR. E. G. COLVIN, C.S.I., Agent to the Governor General in Rajputana, Ajmer.

(After the usual Compliments.)

A perusal of the main point of my case submitted to Your Honour some time ago must have revealed to Your Honour the true nature of my grievances, which I sincerely hope, will be redressed by Your Honour in the near future. But, unfortunately, these are daily increasing and nothing has been done for their prevention. To represent these to your Honour I had deputed my Motmids to Your Honour during the last tour at Ajmer. As these were

## Grievances of the Rawat of Salumbar against Mewar. [Serial No. 15]

not favoured with an opportunity to submit my grievances for Your Honour's consideration I had communicated the same to Your Honour in my Kharita No. 13, dated the 7th October 1910. But now I have come to know from heresay that Your Honour is going away from Rajputana, which has occasioned me unspeakable loss seeing that I am to be deprived of Your Honour's justice. As this is likely to form highly injurious to the interests of my Thikana, I have again deputed my representatives to wait upon Your Honour who will relate to Your Honour at length, the new grievances the Thikana is labouring under, hoping from your kindheartedness, that after hearing the same, steps should be taken for the removal of my troubles.

## 13

Telegram dated the 8th October 1910.

From—RAOJI of Salumbar,  
To—The Agent to the Governor-General, Abu.

Jagirdar Kishen Singh of Isarwas in Salumbar Patta is rebellious on Asoj Sudi 1st Sambat 1967 he is taking assistance of Laxmi Lal Ahelkar Magra Zilla and his attendants and that of Davi Chibodia With a body of 30 men attacked villages of Bunoela Saidadi and Bur of Salumbar Patti and arrested nine Zemindars without any cause and also without letting them know reason of arrest the men treated badly were kept in Kholas whole night and were taken to Sarada thus such assistance given to rebellious Jagirdars by Ahelkars of Sarada always weakens the management of the Patta and ruins people. Therefore you will kindly advise Resident Mewar to interfere in the matter and will arrange to relieve men.

## 14

No. 11-C., dated Camp, the 20th October 1910.

Endorsed by the First Assistant to the Agent to the Governor-General, Rajputana.

Serial No. 10.

Telegram dated the 8th October 1910, from  
the Rao of Salumbar (Serial No. 13).

Forwarded to the Resident, Mewar,  
in continuation of correspondence ending  
with this office endorsement No. 608-P,  
dated the 9th August 1910.

## 15

No. 12, dated Salumbar, the 6th October 1910.

From—RAWAT ONAR SINGH of Salumbar,  
To—The Hon'ble Mr. E. G. COLVIN, C.S.I., I.C.S., Agent to the Governor-General in Rajputana  
Mount Abu.

(After the usual compliments.)

A report of the Tehsildar of Salumbar, dated Asoj Suli 2nd, Sambat 1967 (6th October 1910), stating that yesterday evening Lachmi Lall Khâbiâ, a Sarara official, with a party of 3 or 4 sowars and foot, came to the village of Isarwas; that they are forming a junction with the Jagirdar of Isarwas and some of his employés, all armed *cap à-pie* and numbering about 20 or 25, the party proceeded to the villages of *Banora*, *Har* and *Sedri* and arrested Dangi Jaga Dhanawat, Gotma Kikawat, Gangji Kikawat, Kachria Dhanawat, Balai Harjia of *Sedri*, Jagji Patel of *Banora*, Patel Shivji, Amria, Damar Velia and Punji oson of *Har*, in all, 9 assamis; that after pinioning these, they brought them to village Isarwas beating them all along the way in the porch of the Jagirdar's house and there put them in stocks; that the party was then leaving Isarwas with those assamis which had caused such a harrassment to the people of those 3 villages that they were preparing to desert the villages and that therefore proper arrangements should be made, etc., etc., being read, it is requested that great intransquility prevails owing to the organized refractoriness of my subordinate Jagirdars, who are acquiring increasing strength from the constant encouragement they receive. The Residency has been approached on occasions, more than one, with the prayer that the Magra officials should be ordered to refrain themselves from helping or associating even with this rebellious party. I have a

## Serial No. 15 ] Grievances of the Rawat of Salumbar against Mewar.

brought this matter to Your Honour's notice through my letters No. 60, dated Jeth Badi 8th, and No. 68, dated Asad Badi 10th, Sambat 1966 and No. 1, dated Sawan Badi 8, Sambat 1967, requesting Your Honour to invite the Residency's kind attention thereto and I hope that proper instructions have been issued from Your Honour's office. But, unfortunately, these have failed to carry due weight with the Magra Zilla, which entails a heavy loss upon the Thikana, inasmuch as, this party, encouraged overtly by the Magra officials, carries away the Thikana revenues, liberates prisoners from the Jails and arrests whomsoever it likes. For the last five years or so, they have omitted altogether to discharge their dutiful obligations of service, etc., towards the Thikana, aiming thereby to weaken the Thikana authority, so much so that, increasing as it does, day by day in numbers, it may grow at last, so formidable as to make its suppression by Salumbar an impossibility. Therefore, I would respectfully give Your Honour the trouble to ask the Resident, Mewar, to take proper steps in the matter, prohibiting the Magra officials from siding with them or encouraging them in their refractoriness, for which kindness I shall feel highly thankful.

## 16

No. 369, dated Udaipur, the 1st December 1910.

Endorsed by the Resident in Mewar.

Returned, with report appended, to the First Assistant to the Hon'ble the Agent to the Governor-General, Rajputana, with reference to Serial No. 6. Letter No. 58, dated 10th May 1910, from his endorsement No. 206-P., dated 14th June 1910. Rawat Onar Singh of Salumbar.

*Letter No. 58, dated 10th May 1910, from Rawat Onar Singh of Salumbar, to the Hon'ble the Agent to the Governor-General in Rajputana, Mount Abu.*

The Rawat of Salumbar had already complained to the Durbar, before the above letter was written to the Agent to the Governor-General, about the alleged misconduct of his subordinate Jagirdars. Salumbar was told, in reply, to submit a list of the names of the subordinate Jagirdars against whom complaints were alleged, together with details of their misconduct, in order that an inquiry might be made into the matter. This Salumbar has failed to do. It is therefore clear, the Durbar think, that the allegations are unfounded.

The subordinate Jagirdars, on their part, have been complaining about the conduct of Salumbar towards them. They have sent petitions to the Agent to the Governor-General the Resident, and elsewhere. Salumbar was told to send a *bhala admi* or representative to furnish replies to the alleged grievances of his Jagirdars. This Salumbar has failed to do. The letter under report to the Agent to the Governor-General is nothing but "peshbandi" on Salumbar's part.

It is quite true that the subordinate Jagirdars apply to the Mehturi Tehsil stating their grievances against Salumbar, and seek to obtain justice there. The Mehturi Tehsil is one of the State courts, and no blame can properly be attached to the Jagirdars for making applications there. They have also constantly sent complaints to the Agent to the Governor-General, the Resident, etc.

Salumbar requests that a proclamation be published prohibiting any one from giving shelter or support to the subordinate Jagirdars about whom he complains. But such a proclamation could be issued only if the Jagirdars' guilt were established. They are not dacoits or outlaws, but on the contrary they go to Salumbar and other places where the Rawat of Salumbar happens to be, in order to pay their respects to him, at the Dasehra and on other occasions, Salumbar wishes to have them treated as outlaws merely because they have complained against him.

The Durbar state that the Rawat of Salumbar has started the new and reprehensible practice of putting into prison anyone of his rayats who has ventured to go to the State authorities with a complaint against Salumbar.

The following case, which is regarded by the Durbar as typical if the way things now go on in the Salumbar estate, has come to notice. One Dhula, of Harmatia a Salumbar

## Grievances of the Rawat of Salumbar against Mewar. [Serial No. 17]

asked to produce this Dhula before the Court, but did not do so, and instead took Rs 1,400 from Dhula in consideration of concealing his presence in his village and reporting him as an absentee from the village. When this became known Salumbar was told to send a *bhala adm*, or representative to explain the matter. This he did not do. Meanwhile, the Hakim of the Magra District had managed to get hold of Dhula in another case and elicited all the facts from him. When Dhula got back to his village he was put into prison by Salumbar for having told the State authorities about the matter, and he is still in prison.

A. T. HOLMES.

*The 1st December 1920.*

*Resident, Mewar.*

17

No. 372, dated Udaipur, 1st December 1910.

Endorsed by the Resident in Mewar.

Returned, with report appended, to the First Assistant to the Hon'ble the Agent to the Governor-General, Rajputana, with reference to Serial No. 8. Letter dated 2nd July 1910, from the Rawat his endorsement No. 2759, dated 29th July of Salubar.

*Letter No. 68, dated the 2nd July 1910, from Rawat Onar Singh of Salumbar, to the Hon'ble the Agent to the Governor-General, Rajputana.*

In this letter is a summary or repetition of complaints which have appeared in former letters and petitions.

The Darbar say that the complaints are so vague that they are unable to reply to them without being furnished with further details. For instance, Salumbar asserts that his rayats are beaten and harassed by the Sarara Zilla, that the produce belonging to the Salumbar estate is confiscated by the State authorities, and that the Salumbar cultivators and their cattle are deprived of their means of sustenance. The only reply the Darbar are able to give to such vague complaints is to say that they are unfounded. Had Salumbar given details the Darbar would have directed the Hakim of the Magra Court to conduct an inquiry and report to the Darbar.

Salumbar in this letter repeats again his complaints about his subordinate jagirdars that they commit dacoitis, etc. Unless Salumbar is prepared to assist the Khalsa authorities in making a full inquiry into the matter the actual facts cannot be ascertained, as the subordinate jagirdars, on their part, make equally strong complaints about the harsh and improper treatment meted out to them by Salumbar.

Salumbar states that the Tahsildar of Mehturi sends summonses direct to the rayats of the Salumbar Estate. Unless Salumbar gives the names of the persons who have been so summoned the Darbar cannot reply to this allegation. When anyone files a complaint in a State Court, if the defendant happens to belong to Salumbar, Salumbar is asked to produce the defendant, but he never does so.

Salumbar says similarly that some of his subordinate jagirdars have been sent for direct by the Tahsildar of Mehturi. The actual facts are that there were some cases in which States other than Mewar, as well as Mewar itself, were concerned, and the *prima facie* papers in those cases were sent by the Residency to the Mahkma Khas. The Mahkma Khas sent them on to the Court of the Hakim of the Magra District for compliance. The persons concerned in those cases belonged to Salumbar, so the papers were sent to Salumbar by the Magra Court. Salumbar did not summon the persons concerned, but returned the papers to the Mahkma Khas, not to the Hakim of the Magra District, stating that the subordinate jagirdars would not produce the persons concerned, who belonged to their villages. The Mahkma Khas sent the papers again to the Magra Court, which this time sent for the subordinate jagirdars and asked them to produce the persons concerned. This the subordinate jagirdars did, and they further informed the Magra Court that they had never been asked by Salumbar to produce those persons. Salumbar in this letter under report has made a general accusation that the subordinate jagirdars are sent for direct, but has concealed the fact that Salumbar had falsely charged the subordinate jagirdars with not producing persons whose presence was required in inter-State cases.

## Serial No. 17] Grievances of the Rawat of Salumbar against Mewar.

Salumbar alleges that water is not allowed to be taken from the Jaisamand lake for irrigation purposes, yet nevertheless "the water-tax is forcibly recovered by harassing the zamindars." That allegation, the Darbar state, is entirely untrue. A water-rate is levied only when water is taken for irrigation purposes, and as yet there has been no prohibition whatever against taking water from the lake for irrigation purposes when the people have agreed to pay the water-rate. Some rayats of Salumbar have promised to pay water-rate, and have irrigated their lands with water taken from the lake and have also paid the water-rate.

Salumbar states that the revenues of the villages of Orwaria, Devli, Hikawara and Khumanpura have been attached by the State authorities. About Orwaria details have already been given in the report on letter No. 62, dated the 11th June 1910; and about Hikawara and Khumanpura details have already been given in the report on letter No. 60, dated the 1st June 1910.

*Devli.*—This village does not belong to Salumbar. It belonged to the Jagirdar of Kalianpar, who was subordinate to the Magra Court and independent of Salumbar. The Jagirdar of Kalianpar mortgaged his village Devli to the ancestors of one Gosain Hira Puri, who used to live in Salumbar. The mortgagees, being Sadhus, used to be away on their journeys for long periods at a time, and Salumbar took advantage of that fact to acquire unlawful possession of the village Devli. Hira Puri has now filed a suit in the Court of the Hakim of the Magra District for the recovery of the village, and Salumbar has been asked to send a *bhala admi* or representative to the Court to conduct the defendant's case. The complaint about Devli, therefore, is also, according to the Darbar, a piece of *peshbandi*.

Salumbar further states that the Mahkma Khas does not accept papers submitted to it by Salumbar. On this point the Darbar reply is that only such papers are refused as contain entries which contravene established custom.

A. T. HOLME.

*The 1st December 1920.*

*Resident, Mewar.*

### 18

No. 373, dated Udaipur, the 1st December 1910.

Endorsed by the Resident in Mewar.

Returned, with report appended, to the First Assistant to the Hon'ble the Agent to the Serial No. 10.

Governor-General, Rajputana, with reference to Letter dated 29th July 1910, from the Rawat his endorsement No. 608-P. O.—382-II, dated of Salumbar.

the 9th August 1910.

*Letter No. 1, dated the 29th July 1910, from Rawat Onar Singh of Salumbar, to the Hon'ble the Agent to the Governor-General Rajputana.*

The complaints made in this letter have already been dealt with in the reports on the other letters written by Rawat Onar Singh to the Hon'ble the Agent to the Governor-General.

The Darbar further state that the rayats of Salumbar are always complaining against Salumbar. They go with their complaints to the Court of the Hakim of the Magra District, and when they return to their homes Salumbar has them put into prison for having ventured to complain.

*The 1st December 1920.*

A. T. HOLME.

*Resident, Mewar.*

### 19

No. 374, dated Udaipur, the 1st December 1910.

Endorsed by the Resident in Mewar.

Serial No. 4.

Representations Parts I, II, III, IV and V submitted by the Rawat of Salumbar in regard to certain m. t. is in dispute between him and the Mewar Darbar.

Returned, with report appended, to the First Assistant to the Hon'ble the Agent to the Governor-General, Rajputana, with reference to his endorsement No. 131-P., dated the 21st May 1910.

**Grievances of the Rawat of Salumbar against Mewar. [Serial No. 20]**

*Remarks and opinion on Part V of the Representation from Rawat Onar Singh of Salumbar.*

— *Paragraphs 4 to 8*—I would refer to my opinion on Part I, sections 4 and 5.

I do not think the Salumbar Estate and tenants have any right to receive free irrigation from the Jaisamand.

Nor have they any good claim to ownership of, or control over, the Escape Channel of the lake, which was built wholly by, and at the expense of, the Darbar.

I do not consider that there is any real cause for the apprehensions expressed in paragraph 7.

*Paragraphs 9 to 14.*—I have not discussed with the Mewar Darbar the facts about the jagirdars in subordination to Salimbar, who are said by the latter to be refractory towards him. This is one of the minor causes of friction which have been bred by the parent controversy between the two protagonists. The minor State officials and the subordinate jagirdars no doubt do all they can to add fuel to the fire, being of the opinion that it is to their interest to do so.

*Paragraph 15 to 17.*—These relate to questions the proper authority for settling which is the Boundary Settlement Officer, Mewar.

*Paragraph 18 to 22.*—These relate to minor matters which could easily be settled by the Darbar and Salumbar if a better understanding existed between them.

Salumbar makes out that he is trying to exercise nothing more than his time-honoured rights and privileges, while the Mewar Darbar assert that such are not really rights and privileges but unauthorised encroachments. So far as my experience with the Mewar Darbar has gone, I have found the Maharana always quite ready to acknowledge all rights of his jagirdars which are based on some proper authority granted by one of the Maharana's ancestors or recognised by Mewar or Rajput custom. But, as is well known, during the period when the central authority in Mewar had been reduced to extreme weakness the feudatories usurped, without asking the Maharana's permission, many rights and privileges which they could never have obtained had the central authority retained its original controlling power. In practically every dispute between the Darbar and the jagirdars which still remains unsettled one finds the jagirdar, with Rajput tenacity, asserting that some right or privilege which was really acquired in the manner stated above is an immemorial right or privilege of his house and as such should be acknowledged by the Darbar while the Maharana is no less stubborn in demanding the abrogation of what he insists is an unauthorised encroachment on the right of the Darbar.

It is evident from the second portion of paragraph 22 that Salumbar goes a long way towards claiming entire independence of the Darbar, though he does his best to wrap up his real meaning in a cloud of verbiage.

A. T. HOLME.

*The 1st December 1910.*

*Resident in Mewar.*

**20**

No. 65-P., dated Mount Abu, the 9th May 1911.

From—The HON'BLE MR. E. G. COLVIN, C.S.I., I.C.S., Agent to the Governor-General, Rajputana,

To—The Secretary to the Government of India in the Foreign Department.

\* \* \* \* \*

The Rawat has forwarded with this memorial four others of similar size and description, regarding (i) judicial powers and jurisdiction, (ii) customs and salt compensation, (iii) certain charitable and Muaf villages, and (iv) certain miscellaneous rights and privileges. How far these grievances are based on substantial foundations I have not been able to ascertain but I propose to direct the Resident to urge His Highness the Maharana to treat the Rawat with every consideration in disposing of these petitions, so far as that may appear to be just and proper. I trust that it may not be necessary to trouble the Government of India at all in connection with these four other memorials.

Serial No. 211 Grievances of the Rawat of Salumbar against Mewar.

## 21

No. 1084-I. A., dated Simla, the 24th May 1911.

From—Major S. B. PATTERSON, Assistant Secretary to the Government of India in the Foreign Department,

To—The HON'BLE MR. E. G. COLVIN, C.S.I., I.C.S., Agent to the Governor-General in Rajputana.

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No. 65-P., dated the 9th May 1911, forwarding a memorial from the Rawat Serial No. 20. of Salumbar, in Mewar, claiming the entire

Run land of the Jaisamand Lake as being included in his Patta.

\* \* \* \* \* Your further proposal to direct the Resident in Mewar to urge His Highness the Maharana to treat the Rawat with every consideration in disposing of the four other memorials which he has submitted, so far as that advice may appear to be just and Proper, is approved.

## 22

No. 102-P., dated Mount Abu, the 7th June 1911.

From—R. E. HOLLAND, Esq., I.C.S., First Assistant to the Agent to the Governor-General in Rajputana,

To—The Resident, Mewar.

\* \* \* \* \* 3. As regards the four other memorials of the Rawat I am to say that the question of the action to be taken with reference to them will be discussed during the Agent to the Governor-General's approaching visit to Udaipur.

## 23

NOTE.

Salumbar.

\* \* \* \* \* Part V.—

(a) Will be difficult to support if the claim to the Jaisamand Run lands is thrown overboard.

(b) The Rawat should be supported by the Darbar in these matters.

(c) Has the case been settled by the Boundary Officer?

(d) Of a general character. The settlement of this turns on settlement of Part II.

E. G. COLVIN.

The 23rd June 1920.

## 24

No. 44, dated Udaipur, the 12th February 1913.

From—LIEUTENANT-COLONEL J. L. KAYE, Resident, Mewar,

To—W. H. J. WILKINSON, Esq., I.C.S., First Assistant to the Hon'ble the Agent to the Governor-General, Rajputana.

With reference to the correspondence regarding certain grievances alleged against the Mewar Darbar by the Rawat of Salumbar, ending with your letter No. 57-C., dated the 25th January 1913, I have the honour to forward, for the consideration of the Hon'ble the Agent to the Governor-General, a Kharita dated Magh Budi, 8 Sambat 1969 (29th January 1913), addressed to him by Rawat Onar Singh of Salumbar, bringing to his notice certain grievances, asking for his assistance and requesting that the matters dealt with be brought to the notice of the Government of India.

2. A translation of the Kharita, which is worded in a somewhat obscure manner, is attached.

## Grievances of the Rawat of Salumbar against Mewar. [Serial No. 25]

Translation of Kharita No 9, dated Magh Budi 8 Sambat 1969.

From—RAWAT ONAR SINGH of Salumbar,  
To—The Hon'ble the Agent to the Governor-General in Rajputana.

*Begins with usual compliments.*

You are aware that since Sambat 1963 I have been complaining against officials of the (Mewar) State, and that, owing to their interference in the management of the Thikana in regard to certain pieces of productive lands, villages and other rights, my pecuniary circumstances as well as my landed possessions have undergone much change. My unfortunate condition causes me much anxiety for in spite of my having approached the Government of India, and British officers having taken my case into their hands and consideration, my difficulties have not yet diminished but rather are increasing day by day, owing to which the Thikana is in a moribund state. Up to the present time I have entertained a hope that the Government of India would show me consideration. It is inconceivable that the British Government would hold that ruination of a man of small means is a matter of no importance when weighed with the case of a rich man. No one believes that the decision of the nature of my fate is in the hands of the State and that I have no claim whatever to the sympathy of the Government of India. Nor can I believe that British officers, having in times of calamity interfered into my case, have limited the Thikanas as well as the State's rights by issuing Sanads and Kharitas. Since British Government did not give my case their consideration the State officials, for the past eleven or twelve years, have adopted this policy of harshness, and though I have done everything that I have been advised or that I could think of to promote friendly relations with the officials this hard treatment is not abated. From these circumstances you yourself can judge what must be the result of placing the nature of the decision of my fate in the hands of the Raj officials when the Government of India do not sympathise with me. Now the Thikana is in much distress, and, in addition to those matters, which have formed the subject of applications to British officers, the State officials continue to pursue the same policy of repression. Thus making the excuse that the boundary is under dispute, the produce of villages, the boundaries of which are clearly defined and which have been the property and possession of the Thikana from ancient time, is being restrained by the Raj officials. The Hakim of the Magra Zilla also by instigating and assisting the subordinate jagirdars of the Thikana is causing, day by day, a state of misrule and disturbance in the Thikana. The officials of the State Court summon, in an illegal way, assamis from the Thikana without informing me and treat them as they like. In addition to the changes which have occurred in the prosperity of the Thikana I consider my life to be in danger and ruin to stand me and the Thikana in the face since I have become hopeless to help being rendered to my estate. In these circumstances I have a sanguine hope that you will give my case your careful consideration and do justice to my claims and trust you will also kindly invite the attention of the Resident Sahib to the new difficulties which have arisen and which are threatening the existence of the Thikana. I also earnestly implore you to bring these facts of my changed and unfortunate condition to the notice of the Government of India and recommend my case to their attention since you, who are administering the Province for the last seven or eight years, are, with your experience and insight, well acquainted with the details of my difficulties.

25

*Memorandum of Grievances.*

(1) The Thikana of Salumbar has possessed and enjoyed from ancient times absolute jurisdiction in original Civil and Criminal disputes between parties belonging to Salumbar Thikana. But now, although parties may belong to Salumbar jurisdiction, they are summoned directly and their cases entertained.

(2) In questions of mixed jurisdiction cases were tried at the Sadar Courts in Udaipur, but any realizations of Nazryana, fines, Court-fees and Chowthan (compensation) as realized by and credited to the Thikana. But now the Thikana is punished with Dhonses and made responsible for any fine, etc., that may be awarded in such cases, which is an inconvenient burden upon the Thikana; to say nothing of the harrassment of the subjects.

(3) In criminal cases Salumbar subjects attended State Courts along with a *bhala adm* (representative) of the Thikana, which are handed over to the representative after their statements were recorded. Now they are no more restored, but are kept in State custody.

## Serial No. 25] Grievances of the Rawat of Salumbur against Mewar.

(4) Formerly in all cases, Criminal or Civil, whenever the attendance of any party or Parties was required by the State Courts it was done through the Thikana by means of letters. Whereas, now the Sarara Zilla and Tehsil Mehturi areet the assanis quite independent of the Thikana, without even informing it of the same

(5) Though the Dhonses, the imposition of which was ever unjustified, have been withdrawn, undue and coercive stress is laid upon they payment of their pay threatening the Thikana with the seizure of my villages in case of default.

(6) The Run (alluvial soil) Jaisamand has belonged to the Thikana from centuries now and has been enjoyed as such. But, by and by, boundary disputes were set up, which resulted in an official announcement that the Boundary Settlement Department would decide these in the light of boundary disputes. In contravention of this the whole Run has been declared to be belonging to the State, which ruins 15 of the Thikana villages and leaves only the huts of the cultivators. In all the Thikana is thereby put to the annual loss of Rs 20,000 (twenty thousand) nearly.

(7) The following villages, viz., *Namla, Roba, Kherar, Kharoria* and *Sathpur*, situate behind the Jaisamand and enjoying riparian ownership over the Escape Channel (*Oota*) have also been depopulated owing to its supply being stopped. The reason being that there are no wells, tanks, or any other reservoir save the lake water, carried through canals.

(8) A few of the Thikana villages situate in the Run Jaisamand have ever been irrigating their lands by the lake water. But now these are totally stopped from doing so, nay, leaving the question of irrigation aside even the cattle have been forbidden to drink therefrom. Owing to this the cultivators are in great trouble and would very soon emigrate and leave the village in ruin. They have got no reserve supply of water to fall back upon, both for drinking and irrigating purposes save the lake water.

(9) All communications bearing on the Run question and submitted to the Mahkma Khas are rejected summarily.

(10) In Zilla Chhappan, the *Bhog* (Thikana's share of the produce) of a good many villages of the Thikana is forcibly recovered by inducing fresh boundary disputes. To quote instances, the grain produce of Deoli Tank, Hikawara, Khuamnpura, and Dholapanaka-gorha was taken away by the Tehsildar of Bumina and no regard was paid to the Thikana representations showing its unbroken possession over these.

(11) A boundary dispute having been set up between Orwaria Putta, Salumbur, and Kaduni Khalsa the Thikana submitted proofs in support of its proprietary rights over the debated areas, and was thereby made over its share of the produce. But in Sambat 1966 the rabi crop was attacked wholesale, weighing nearly 2,500 maunds and the rayats were put to a very heavy loss. Now even though security bonds proving to deposit the revenue accrued therefore have been produced in the Settlement Office, the cultivators are not allowed to use the land. Neither the case is being settled, nor there is any responsible officer to do so.

(12) A similar dispute has been set up in the villages of Kelai, and the seizure of its revenue is not far off.

(13) A contour line has been drawn round Jaisamand, which further swamps most of the lands by increasing the height of the *Oota*. But higher areas, left untouched by both are also suffering from encroachments at the hands of the "Tehsildar, Mehturi."

(14) The payment of salt compensation has been suspended since Sambat 1957, which covers a big amount.

This is contrary to procedure, credited to the Thikana's so-called debt on account of Nezrana and fines, which is in itself unjust.

(15) The same case is with the custom: compensation.

(16) The following *sasni* villages, viz., *Toda, Serai-Adkalia, Sespur, Samora, Dhawri, Nelli, Korakra* and *Bhatwara* have ever belonged to Salumbur jurisdiction. Whereas the present policy is to replace Salumbur jurisdiction by that of Sarara (Magra Zilla Centre).

(17) The villages of *Intali Khera*, *Kholri*, etc., are similarly subjected to Sarara interference on the flimsy ground of there being a few houses of Brahmins in the said villages, which are said to be under Khalsa jurisdiction.

(18) Similarly Lasaria jurisdiction is being extended over the Salumbar village of Para, which has continued in the possession of Salumbar for centuries now.

(19) In the recent census the Zillas Sarara and Chittor, having forcibly and against past precedents, numbered the houses, filled in the census schedules. This was an innovation upon and encroachments with the past censuses of Sambits 1937, 47, 57.

(20) Of late the Mahkma Khas has made it a point to reject most of the official communications of the Thikana by raising objections to the use of certain words which have been in vogue from olden times, such as Kacheri, Adalat, Zilla, Tehsil, Kotwali, Hakim Zilla, Kacheri, Sarishta, Robakar, Tajwiz, Tahqiqat, Sadar, Kacheris, etc. And since no reason is shown for the above action it disturb the otherwise peaceful course of the work.

(21) Communications received from the Mahkma Khas show an unwarranted departure from the old practice of addressing the Thikana. When old papers are cited in support of the Thikana objection, no regard is paid to them.

The Thikana is insulted in the matter of old etiquette. On the occasion of a death in the family, it is the custom of His Highness to pay a condolence visit at the Salumbar Haveli. Nay, on two occasions the present Highness has come to the Haveli. But when my mother died the condolence visit honour was not favoured. Even in the late Matampursi question the Maharaj Kunwar was deputed and I had to put up with it. When I came to Udaipur along with the Maharaj Kunwar I requested for the Talwarbandi ceremony for full one year, but my entreaties were unheeded, although the custom was that I should leave Udaipur after going through the Talwarbandi ceremony, which was in no way less than an insult.

(23) In the Jagir villages of Kanwarji Tejsinghji and Mañ Singhji's wives, officials have been appointed by the Sarara Zilla, who have begun to assess and collect the revenue and doing Civil and Criminal work. Moreover, the Mahkma Khas has ordered the Thikana to convert the jagir into cash payment otherwise the same would be paid off from the State exchequer and the villages in question confiscated. This is an out-and-out interference in the internal affairs in the Thikana.

(24) From ancient times the Thikana is privileged to put on its insignia on ceremonial occasions. But now fresh objections are made to it.

(25) Jagirdars owing subordination to the Thikana are encouraged in their refractoriness by the Tahsil Mehturi and Sarara Zilla. Backed by this connivance these have, over and above their own jagirs, seized the Thikana villages of Amalwa, Sutaria, Jaipura, Namla, Bhanor, Baran, etc., and carry off the Bhog of these villages. By encroaching upon the Khalsa lands they have unduly increased the bounds of their own villages. They have ceased to serve the Thikana, nor obey its orders. Nor do they allow it to arrest criminals in their limits. And, in case, the Thikana arrests one he is forcibly liberated from the jail, and, if checked, they prepare for assault. Nay, they even put into confinement the Thikana Assamis and go to the length of imposing and realising fines from them, beating and otherwise torturing those who do not comply with their wishes. The Isarwas Jagirdar, the leader of the rebellious party being dead the competing claimants to the Jagir have been turned rebels. The Sarara Zilla has appointed its own manager there, thus openly interfering in what was my hereditary right, the right of appointing a successor to my feudal Jagirs by managing the jagir in the interest of the next successor till the appointment of the proper one.

(26) In the neighbourhood of Salumbar there is a spot which goes by the name of Baba Nawalgar's Dhuni. To this place the Magra Hakim pays occasional visits lasting for some days, apparently with the object of holding holy communion with the saint, but in reality Salumbar subjects are induced to deal directly with the Khalsa Courts. The said Hakim has appointed an outpost there, and through the sentry in-charge the Thikana Assamis from the adjoining villages are summoned by Baba Nawalgar who subjects them to diverse harassments. Papers bearing out the above are held by the Thikana.

(27) The Udaipur Police is treating the Thikana villages of Kotra, etc., as if Salumbar was entitled to no judicial Jurisdiction at all.

## Serial No. 26] Grievances of the Rawat of Salumbar against Mewar.

(28) On occasions of marriages in His Highness's family it is the custom that marriage invitations to the Thikana are sent with one of the Paswans (officials who always attend upon His Highness), who is given a robe of honour according to his position. But now this has been discontinued, and the money, equivalent to the said robe, is forcibly recovered from the Thikana under punishment with confiscation.

(29) I am to serve for three months, during which period if His Highness leaves Udaipur I sleep at the palace. But now I am ordered to attend upon His Highness in camp against all precedent.

(30) No attention is paid to the merits of the cases, in which the Thikana Assamis are involved. On the other hand, the Thikana is fined and held responsible for damages through judgments sent to it, which cover a big amount. This is against old procedure.

(31) The Thikana owes the *Parmeshran* treasury the sum of Rs 102-2-0 as principal. This has been calculated and multiplied at compound interest, which amounts a large sum.

(32) The Naib Hakim, Lasaria, has caused the embankment of Kesar Sagar, an old tank near Karawli village, to be pulled down, which, besides doing injury to the embankment, has deprived three villages of the Thikana of the benefits of irrigation.

(33) The villagers of Mehturi killed the Dangi of Karawali. The Sarara authorities took no notice of the case.

(34) Some 30 or 40 armed Zamindars of Salara, with the son of Kubeer Singh, attacked the house of Huringa Damir and killed him. The Sarara authorities are trying to weaken and explain away the Thikana's efforts in bringing the guilt home to the guilty. Now it is clearly manifest in what way my subjects are put to ruin.

## 26

Letter No. 35, dated 24th April 1917.

From -RAWAT ONAR SINGH of Salumbar.

To -The HON'BLE Sir ELLIOR G. COLVIN, K.C.S.I., Agent to the Governor-General in Rajputana, Mount Abu.

I beg to remind you that when I paid my respects to you in October last, and presented my Kharita and note, and also recounted my troubles before you, you had been kind enough to console me and advised me to wait patiently. Accordingly I have been waiting till now—and what other alternative is open to me, but I regret no steps have yet been taken to mitigate my sufferings, and instead I am daily being subjected to new troubles. When I am commanded to wait, it is but just and merciful to protect me against new troubles till an enquiry is made into my former plaints.

I have been duly bringing every matter into the notice of the Mahkma Khas and the Resident but unfortunately no redress has been given to me; and in the case of my appeals against Boundary Settlement cases I have received from the Resident the disappointing reply that he cannot interfere in these matters.

Weary of the unbearable burden of my troubles I beg once more to trouble you and hope that you will give me shelter, for I am now incapable of bearing the weight which every day grows heavier. My Thikana is ruined, my lands and income are not half what they were before, my people are deserting their homes and lands owing to the tyranny and cruelty of the Sarada Sowars and sepoys, my subordinate jagirdars have grown refractory and insubordinate because of the instigation and help of the Sarada Hakim and administration of the Thikana has on this account become a hopeless task. The sowars and sepoys of Khalsa forcibly gather corn and realize rents from my farm, my ancient possessions, and subject my people to innumerable cruelties. They meddle with my servants also, and quite recently one of my sepoys lost his life by the wilful aggressiveness of one of the sowars. My ancient rights are ruthlessly being trampled over, and I am quite helpless to defend myself. There is no exaggeration in this description, and it is incomprehensible why Government does not take pity on my state and intervene to give me justice.

I bitterly deplore my evil fortune, when looking around I see that the British Government, which, in spite of being paramount and supreme in the land, does not in the least encroach on the rights of the ancient princes or people; which is always ready to defend the weak

and helpless against the tyranny of the strong ; whose courts and tribunals are open at all hours to listen to the poorest against the greatest and dispense impartial justice, even such an ideal Government does not hold out a finger to help me in my distress.

From its advent in India to the present day Government has sacredly preserved in every particular the ancient possessions and dignity of all native princes. This admirable policy has made the Government a cynosure of the world's eyes, and is the cause of the deep affection existing between the Government and the princes. The ancient greatness of this Thikana, the proud and noble self-sacrifice of its founder, and the valuable services of its subsequent chiefs to the Mewar State are well known to history, and to you. It is therefore a pity to think why Government in accordance with its old policy does not turn its eyes towards this Thikana and seeing it every day falling lower down from its old pedestal yet refrains from helping it.

Before the spread of the British rule in India the princes of this land used to settle their feuds and disputes by the sword, but Government suppressed the sword and in its place reared up the standard of peace and security. It constituted itself an impartial arbiter between the princes and undertook to decide and settle their differences. In view of these facts it is incomprehensible why Government, in this instance, refrains from doing this sacred duty.

I consider Shri Daibar my earthly master, and in accordance with the noble example of my ancestors I am proud and ready to obey him loyally in every particular. My cry is simply for the preservation of my hereditary possessions and dignity.

I am not so presumptuous as to demand the Government to step in to help me merely because of my outcry. My just and reasonable prayer is only that proper enquiries be made and a commission be appointed by the Government to investigate the matter and give me justice.

The Mahkma Khas or any other department or official subservient cannot judge my cause. The dispute lies between this Thikana and the State, of which such departments being parts are themselves virtually a party to the dispute ; hence it is against both law and common sense to expect impartial justice from them.

I respectfully beg to inform you that my condition is now truly critical, and unless Government turns its attention towards this Thikana what remains of it would also be soon ruined. I and this Thikana have in the end sought your protection, and I hope you will not refuse to help me, for to help those who are helpless and seek shelter has been characteristic of all truly brave men and the British Government.

I also pray that until steps are formally taken to investigate and judge my case something may be done to protect this Thikana from future aggressions in the meantime.

For this act of exceeding kindness I shall remain for ever deeply grateful.

I beg to enclose a statement of my troubles that have arisen after the submission of my Kharita and note and hope you will give it your kind attention.

#### APPENDIX.

1. Moza Kelai is my hereditary village which has been in my possession for centuries. The Settlement Officer has without any cause created grounds for a dispute regarding this village in his judgment in the case of Agbra *versus* Adwas. The Sarada Hakim seizing this opportunity sent his sowars and had rents realised for the Kharif. I wrote to the Mahkma Khas but nothing was done, nor have I been told why such aggressiveness is permitted. When the sowars are asked to show a written authority of the Mahkma Khas or the Sarada they say that they have the Hakim's verbal orders. In the Rabi also, only a few days ago my Sehna who was there was compelled to leave the village. I had given information of this by wire to you on the instant. The Sehna has now been turned out and the sowars are collecting rents. How far such a proceeding is just and proper I submit to your judgment and beg you to kindly arrange to have the collected rents returned to me.

2. Moza Dantari also is my hereditary village, which has been given to the Charans. They died without an heir and left only two widows. No heir has yet been appointed and the matter is under consideration. Karnedan's widow also died and Hamirdan's widow was

## Serial No. 26] Grievances of the Rawat of Salumbar against Mewar.

not there, the Ziladar of Mewal reported that the widow's property was being tampered with. Thereupon an Ahalkar was sent from here to look after the property. But the Sarada Hakim sent his sowars there who called Bhowanidanji Charan who is a Jagirdar of the State, and tore off the chits that my Abalkar had put on the property, and with the help of Bhowanidan and a servant named Panna had some of the property smuggled away. I wrote to the Mahkma Khas, but instead of giving redress the Mahkma Khas wrote in reply that the village was a Jagir of the State and the Ahalkars of Salumbar should be called back. How far this proceeding is just I beg to submit to your judgment.

3. On complaint being received from Dungarpur State against the lack of police arrangements on the border, and in accordance with the orders of the Resident and the wishes of Dungarpur this Thikana had placed a Thana at a suitable place in the village of Manpur. Since the matter had originated from Dungarpur's complaint and arrangement has been made according to their wishes the Sarada Hakim had no cause or right to interfere in the matter; yet he instigated my Jagirdar of Isarwas who assaulted my men and routed them. Dungarpur had suggested a Thana at Manpur and a Chowki at Bhabrana Patta Bhadesar, but the Sarada Hakim maliciously suggested a Thana at Rathri and a Chowki at Panganna, both Patta Salumbar thus burdening the Thikana with increased expense. He also contrived to get such orders issued by the Mahkma Khas and I had to act accordingly. He has now, in spite of my sepoy's being already there, sent his sowars to these posts who are molesting the people, and their aggressiveness has even cost the life of one of my sepoy's. I have repeatedly requested the Mahkma Khas but the sowars have not been recalled.

4. My Jagirdar of Isarwas has grown insubordinate and refractory owing to the help, and instigation of the Sarada Hakim. The Zemindars of Manpur had complained to me, against the Jagirdar's oppression and an enquiry in the matter was ordered. But the Jagirdar in spite of repeated calls did not come to clear himself: he even returned my orders and letters with insolent replies and doubled his cruelties. In order to protect the Zemindars, and keep them from deserting the village, I then placed some of my men in the village but the Sarada Hakim has sent his sowars there and they and the Jagirdar's men are together oppressing the poor people who are flying away. The Sarada Hakim has no authority thus to send his sowars to my villages and I have written to the Mahkma Khas about it but no steps have yet been taken.

5. The Boundary Settlement Department has been organised to do justice but the present native officer has done great harm to me by *ex parte* proceedings. I have filed my appeals in the Mahkma Khas and submitted objections to you also through the Resident. The Mahkma Khas has up to the present done nothing in the matter and the Settlement Officer has decided more cases without my Motmid and in some cases he and the Sarada Hakim have actually forced and intimidated my assamis and Jagirdar to indicate the line according to their wishes. On receipt of these judgments I shall submit my appeals; but if this procedure is continued very soon not half my lands will be left to me. I invite your kind attention to this and beg you to kindly intercede and stop further proceedings till the appeals are decided.

6. Out of the salt compensation given to the State by the Government Rs 25 fall to this Thikana's share. Its payment has been stopped since Sambat 1957 and a sum of Rs 11,600 has accumulated to this Thikana's credit. In spite of repeated requests this amount has not yet been paid and recently the Mahkma Khas has authorised a deduction of Rs 8,527-11-3 out of it owing to nazrana and fines due from the Thikana's Assamis. Such nazrana and fines have always been realised and kept here and are not sent to the State. The matter was referred to the State but without making any enquiries or examining my proofs and documents an arbitrary judgment was given. I protested against it but my papers were not accepted. I then referred the case to the Resident and it remains yet undecided. Until the point is cleared such a deduction is highly improper and unjust. Now a further sum of Rs 1,252 British coin and Rs 1,111-4-0 Udaipuri have been recovered from it on account of settlement expenses. This amount has unjustly been imposed on Salumbar and I have filed my objections against this course but notice of these have been taken. In this connection my village Amarpura also has been confiscated and I beg to draw your kind attention to the point.

7. Moza Angni also is one of my hereditary villages which has been given away in Jagir. There are hundreds of proofs to establish this fact, but the Sarada Hakim has declared it to be a Moza of Agar Deh Khalsa Pargana Lhasara and thus laid the foundations of a fresh dispute. I have written about this to the Resident also giving full details, and I pray you to kindly intercede with the Resident on my behalf otherwise I am afraid this village also would be wrested out of my possession.

8. I had verbally told you about my grievances about the annual chakri. This year also I have been to Udaipur on the Dasehra occasion. I fell ill there and doctors recommended a change of climate. I applied for permission to go but it was refused, and I had to remain there for more than the usual time before permission was given to return. I have now again received a letter from the Mahkma Khas calling me back to Udaipur, and I hope you will kindly take notice of it.

## 27

Letter No. 263, dated the 14th May 1917.

From—B. J. GLANCY, Esq., I.C.S., First Assistant to the Agent to the Governor-General in Rajputana,

To—LIEUTENANT-COLONEL J. L. KAYE, I.A., Resident, Mewar.

I am directed to forward, in continuation of this office endorsement No. 246\* of May 3rd,

\*Destroyed. 1917, a letter No. 35, dated 24th April 1917, from the Rawat of Salumbar, and to enquire whether any new circumstances requiring the Hon'ble the Agent to the Governor-General's attention have arisen.

## 28

No. 44, dated the 31st May 1917.

From—RAWAT ONAR SINGH of Salumbar, Mewar,

To—The HON'BLE SIR ELLIOT G. COLVIN, K.C.S.I., Agent to the Governor-General, Rajputana.

I have from time to time been writing to you about my troubles and now beg to bring one more matter to your notice, and pray you to do something to remove my trouble, for I am now in great distress.

In the year 1905 Dungarpur State wrote to the Resident, Mewar, complaining against the Bhils of Manpur and Budail Toluk Salumbar, Bhabrana Patta Bhadesar, and Lohagar Patta Dhariavad and requested him to make suitable police arrangements. A copy of this was received here through the Mahkma Khas, and accordingly I placed a Thana at Manpur, in consideration of the notorious Pals of Manpur and Budail, and advised the Mahkma Khas of it.

It is known to you already that my Jagirdar of Isarwas has grown insubordinate, and refractory owing to the instigation and help of the Sarada Hakim. Instead of due submission he returns back even my proper orders with insolent answers. The Pals of Manpur and Budail also are in the Isarwas Jagir, and this Jagirdar, at the instigation of the Hakim, had routed my Thana from Manpur, and in the case of the theft of cattle belonging to Kodar Singh, resident of Kanoria, the Sarada Hakim proposed to the Mahkma Khas to transfer the Thana to Rathre from Manpur. The Mahkma Khas wrote to Salumbar for compliance, and, although Salumbar did not agree with the Hakim's views since Manpur was much suited for the establishment of Thana to watch the criminal tribes, while Rathre which consisted of only a few huts, was a very inconvenient place, yet when the Mahkma Khas did not listen I had to place a Thana at Rathre.

Owing to non-establishment of chowkis along the whole border Dungarpur again moved for the establishment of the following chowkis—Manpur, Devlan, Bhabrana, Karakla, Intali, Deopura, etc. But even then the Sarada Hakim out of his avowed antipathy for Salumbar saddled this Thikana with the whole burden and wrote to the Mahkma Khas that—

1. "Instead of Manpur and Deolan the Thana should be at Rathre since the place is close to the boundary line ;
2. "The Rajputs of Bhabrana are bold and sturdy people; hence the chowki should be placed at Pangamra Patta Salumbar instead of Bhabrana Patta Bhadesar."

## Serial No. 28] Grievances of the Rawat of Salumbar against Mewar.

The Mahkma Khas sent a copy of the above report here for compliance. But from the enclosed map of Mewar-Dungarpur boundary it would be clear to you that Hakim's arguments are lame, and not in good faith, because—

1. Manpur owing to its proximity to the notorious Pals is exactly suited for the establishment of a police station;
2. Although Rathre is close to the line Devlan is closer still being very close to the chowkis of Kanoria and Banwasa on the Dungarpur side, also it would have been very convenient to the police on either side;
3. On account of his personal bias the Hakim has left out Bhabarna with the excuse that the Rajputs there are bold and sturdy people; but I beg you to consider that—
  - (i) It is quite close to the boundary line;
  - (ii) Offenders usually pass through it into Dungarpur territory, hence a chowki here is very necessary;
  - (iii) If as the Hakim says the Rajputs of this place are able to check crimes why did not they do so till now, and why has Doongarpur complained against it and proposed a chowki there. Besides, rayats however bold and sturdy they may be cannot do police work since they have neither the training nor the right to do it.
4. Pangamra is neither close to the Pals of Intali, Budail Lohagar, etc., nor do offenders pass through it; hence a chowki there is useless and only calculated to burden Salumbar with unnecessary expense.
5. All the other places except Karakla being Khalsa, or in the Jagirs of Khalsa have conveniently been passed over; but, truly speaking, chowkis are very necessary there, for two chowkis of Salumbar on line extending over nearly 40 miles can not be expected to keep watch over the whole area.

I pointed all this out to the Mahkma Khas, but against those of the Sarada Hakim my arguments were not listened to and I had to place a chowki at Pangamra also and bear unnecessary expenses. I beg to enclose a copy of the Dungarpur Diwan's No. 1365 letter also to show that this arrangement is against the wishes of his State also. The enclosed copy of Thanadar Aspur's letter will also show that Dungarpur has no complaint against my chowkis, it is now complaining against the non-establishment of chowkis in Mewar near the Pal of Intali, etc.

In other matters, too, I have shown to you the Sarada Hakim's antipathy for Salumbar and in this case, too, he had been making false reports against the Thikana to the Mahkma Khas. Now, in spite of my men being there he has sent his sowars and sepoys to Rathre and Pangamra with a view to ruin one of my districts known as Magra, to encroach on my judicial rights and weaken my rule, and to ruin my people and saddle the Thikana with the burden of expenses. These sowars instead of doing any real work are cruelly oppressing my people and insulting my servants, details of which would appear from the enclosed statement. Besides these the Girdawar of Sarada had, unknown to Salumbar, arrested the Zemindars of Rathre and Pangamra and has extracted from them promise to pay all rents and revenue to Khalsa instead of the Jagirdars. This is bound to ruin the poor Jagirdars—Sarada is, besides contriving to annex some more of my villages under the pretext of realising the expenses of maintaining his sowars. Without the secret support of the Hakim these sowars dare not commit such violence openly in my villages. Their oppressions have gone so far that one of my sepoys has been killed at the chowki of Pangamra. I beg to assure you that my people and my servants are now incapable of bearing further troubles; yet what can they do against these sowars? In some villages the Zemindars had fled away since they could not endure such cruelties, and my servants could with difficulty persuade them to return. When my Ahalkars try to restrain these sowars from oppressing the people they become ready to fight. It is their aim to draw my men into a quarrel so that a charge may be built up against the Thikana.

I have repeatedly written to the Mahkma Khas and requested the Resident also, but unfortunately these sowars have not yet been recalled. If they are allowed to remain they would oppress my people and very soon many of my villages, e.g., Rathre, Pangamra, Jaitana, Amalwa, Jodhpura, Mulguda, Delvan Chote and Mote, Birwa Moti and Chote, Kachrya, Shampura, Dogocha, Harmatya, Jingni, etc., shown in the map, would be utterly ruined, and an unbearably heavy loss of revenue would ensue. Many of these are in Jagirs, and the Jagirdars, too, would be reduced to beggary.

One of my districts known as Mewal has already been ruined by the Hakim, and now he has turned his eyes towards the remaining two districts (Magra and Chappan), and when these are also ruined the destruction of Salumbar would be complete.

When Salumbar takes full responsibility on itself and has made and undertakes to maintain satisfactory police arrangements it is incomprehensible why these sowars should be kept there.

My Thikana has already been ruined and my income reduced to less than half. These sowars have now received some more of my villages, and in its fallen state the Thikana can ill afford to bear the heavy expense of maintaining these sowars for no purpose.

I am bound to write first to the Mahkma Khas, but when it does not give any consideration to my proper requests I am obliged to appeal to you and the Resident. Naturally, one who is in great pain cannot sit quietly, he must think of a thousand means to mitigate his suffering. I, too, am daily being subjected to new troubles, and when my wailings are not attended to I run to seek your refuge as the last resort. If this procedure is improper the proper course may kindly be pointed out, so that I may act accordingly. If I have unwillingly committed an offence it may kindly be pointed out, so that I may try to make suitable atonement. I am ready to obey you in every particular I do not cry against anyone, but only for preservation of my Thikana and established rights.

I am now sore pressed and would have come myself to pay my respects, but illness has confined me to bed. As soon, however, as I get even a little better I shall come and relate my sufferings before you. In the meanwhile my people daily come and cry to me in distress for help, and their distress augments my bodily pain and sufferings, and I pray you to mercifully have these sowars removed from my villages and save my people from ruin and distress and to take my other appeals also in hand. My destiny is in your hands, and I am confident you will not refuse to give me succour, for which act of exceeding kindness I and my people will ever bless you.

Translation of the Deongarpur Dewan's letter No. 1235.

In reply to your letter No. 428 of Magh Sud 6th, 1873, asking our opinion whether it would be proper to place a Thana at Manpur and a Chowki at Bhabrana to keep watch over the criminal tribes in Mewar limits, etc., I have the honour to state that, after consultation with our Superintendent of Police also, I agree with you that it would really be well to have police stations at Manpur and Bhabrana. Besides these two places chowkis at Karakla and Deopura also would be very useful.

Translation of Thanadar Aspur's letter.

In reply to your No. 1273 I have the honour to state that I am quite satisfied with Salumbar's police arrangements at Rathre and Pangamra, against which I have no complaint, nor was any report made to the Hakim Magra with whom we have no concern. Of course, since the Bhils of Intali had committed offences under section 394, I. P. C., and made raids in our territory, the matter was reported to higher authorities to move to Mewar State to make proper police arrangements in that quarter. We have no complaint against Salumbar and made no reports against it. We shall always maintain the relations existing between Salumbar and our State.

Statement showing the oppressions committed by the sowers of Sarada on the subjects of the Salumbar Patta at Rathre, Pangamra, and neighbouring villages.

Serial No. 28 ] Grievances of the Rawat of Salumbar against Mewar.

Serial No.	No and date of report.	Designation of officer making the report	Brief summary of the report	Number and date of letter sent to the Mahkana Khass.
1	No. 28 of Baisak Bad 6th, 1973	Naik Ahmad Ali; Thindar, Rathre.	The sowers and sepoys of Sarada have begun to force the villagers to bring water for them in Begar. They enter into houses and forcibly carry away grass, firewood, and anything else they want. Consequently zimindars have fled from the village.	No. 768 of Baisak Bad 11, 1973.
2	No. 15 of Baisak Sud 4th, Sambat 1973	Do. (through Ziladar, Magra)	The sowers of Sarada have cruelly beaten Amiri Mini in her house in connection with the carrying of water for their use.	No. 834 of Baisak Bad 11, 1973.
3	No. 73 of ditto	Ditto	The sowers of Sarada, on the Chait Sud 9th, took grass from Jodhpura without paying for it and made Lalay, Kora, Rupba, Gobna, etc., to carry it on their head to Rathre where they kept them for the whole day and forced them to bring ten more bundles on the next day.	No. 858 of Jaith Bad 6th, 1973.
4	No. 380 of Baisak Sud 10th, 1973	The Ziladar of Magra	The sowers of Sarada, who are at Rathre and Girdhavar Raghunath Singhji have had roofing tiles and doors of Dhunya and Chanchya houses pulled down and brought down to Rathre from Larmatya to build a house for themselves.	No. 877, Jaith Bad 12th 1973.
5	No. 379 of ditto	Ditto	The sowers of Sarada came armed with lathis; determined to quarrel and forcibly took away the wooden posts, etc., which were purchased for sundry repairs, and were lying at our Thana. Girdhavar Raghunath Singhji also was standing and watched the proceedings. In addition to oppressing the people the sowers have now begun to attack the Thana also. Our men kept their place, otherwise a fight was inevitable.	.....
6	No. 369 of Baisak Sud 7th, 1973	Ditto	Day before yesterday Girdhavar Raghunath Singhji came with sepoys and sepoys to Rathre and sent his sepoys to our villages, namely, Hirmaty, Kachery, Atmalwra, Jodhpur, Jijiri, Devtan, etc., who surrounded the people and lind the tiles and doors of Dhunya and Chanchya pulled and brought down to Rathre, etc.	No. 760 of Chait Sud 13th, 1973.
7	Chait Bad 14th, No. n/a	Rathor Gulab Singhji from Pangamra.	This afternoon three sepoys and a sepoys came from Sarada into our Thana. Then they went away and fixed their quarters at some distance from us. In the evening they had some hot words and blows with the villagers. In the evening a sepoys came to our Thana and wanted to take away Karning's cot forcibly. In this struggle the trigger of the gun which was lying charged with shots on that chair got pulled and the discharge was lodged in Karning's right leg. Since the blood could not be stanched, Karning has been sent to Salumbat. He was in great pain, etc.	Subsequent enquiry has revealed that the sepoys' name is Khajoo, and it cannot be denied that he took the initiative and sought a quarrel without cause. Subsequently Karning died of his injuries in spite of medical aid.

8	No. 414, Chait Sud 7th, Samhat 1973	Ziladar Intalikhers	Kubera Balai was working in our Thana when Sultanbeg, sovar, came and caught hold of him. The Balai said that after performing his duties here, he would come to their quarters. But the sovar kicked him and struck him with his fists and stick and carried him forcibly away.	Ditto.
9	No. 127 Baisak Sud 2nd, 1973	Ditto	Dalla, son of Poonja Dangri, stated that Sowar Fakhr Mohamed entered his house and forcibly took away 'Gras' and struck him with his fists. When he protested the sovar threatened to beat him. All his earthen utensils were contaminated. In spite of the fact that grass is given to them from the Ganj these sovars commit such raids.	No. 831 of Baisak Sud 11th, 1973.
10	No. 184 of Baisak Sud 11th, 1973	Ditto	Sowars Sultanbeg and Khajoo of Sareda extorted provisions worth R17.8-9 from Keya, Channa, Kashra, Amrechand, Gulabchand, Onkar, Hirachand, Sobhachand, Dhulchand, Birechand, Pragchand, Mahajans of Jaifana and did not pay the price.	No. 869 of Jeth Bad 7th, 1973.
11	No. 120 of Baisak Sud 12th, 1973	Ditto	Sowar Fakhr Mohamed struck Karinga, Mina of Pangamra with shots in spite of his carrying water for these sovars.	No. 847 of Jeth Sud 1st, 1973.
12	No. 205 of Baisak Sud 12th	Ziladar Intalikhers	Lala, son of Jugla Mina of Pangamra, stated that sowar Fakhr Mohamed came to his house and forcibly took him away to sweep away horse dung. When I protested against his beating me he gave me kicks and then slapped me. We do all work for them and yet these sovars oppress us.	No. 875 of Jeth Bad 10th.
13	Baisak Sud 14th, No. niz	Baravat Girdhari Singhji	Prior to my reaching Pangamra the Girdawar had arrested and carried away the Zemindars of Pangamra. I overtook him at Kundle, and pleaded with him to which he replied that he had arrested the Zemindars to obtain from them an admission of not paying rents to the Jegerdar and said that he had orders also to withhold rents. I argued a long time with him before he made over the Zemindars to me.	.....
14	No. 214 Jeth Bad 5th, 1973	Ziladar Intalikhers	Lalbeg, Ilahibux, and Khajoo sovars of Sarada assaulted Deva and Khem Dangis of Garcha, and forcibly carried away two <i>entari</i> 's valued R5 and a bamboo <i>tatti</i> valued R1.8-0 on the heads of Hira and Meera Dangis and Ronya Minn.	Jaith Sud 31st, 1973.

Serial No. 29] Grievances of the Rawat of Salumbar against Mewar.

## 29

No.  $\frac{340}{31}$ , dated Mount Abu, the 15th June 1917.

Endorsed by the First Assistant to the Agent to the Governor-General, Rajputana.

Letter No. 44, dated the 31st May 1917, from Rawat Orar Singh of Salumbar in Mewar, with enclosures. (Serial No. 28.)

Forwarded to the Resident, Mewar, for favour of a brief report.

## 30

No. 54, dated Mewar, the 30th June 1917.

From—RAWAT ORAR SINGH of Salumbar,

To—The HON'BLE SIR ELLIOT G. COLVIN, K.C.I.E., Agent to the Governor-General in Rajputana, Mount Abu.

In continuation of my last letter No. 44, dated the 31st May 1917, I beg to state that in spite of my repeated requests no steps are taken by the Mahkma Khas to remove my trouble or to check the aggressiveness of the Sarada employés—my troubles are consequently daily increasing.

Recently Girdawar Raghunath Singhji of Sarada took the zamindars of my villages (both Khalsa Jagir) in custody, and by force and intimidation extorted from them written pledges to pay all rents and revenue to Sarada in future. The Girdawar is stated to have told the zamindars that these pledges are obtained to meet the cost of maintaining the sowars of Sarada at Rathre, and Pangamra. The list of villages from which such pledges have been extorted is as follows:—

1. Jallara	Khalsa.
2. Kyarda	„ Mazra Khandela.
3. Dharakar	„ „
4. Sutarya	„ „
5. Thunith Mahura	„ „
6. Rathre	in the Jagi of Vil Devi Singhji.
7. Pangamra.	„ „ Dasimdo Piatab Singhji.
8. Garda	„ „ „
9. Ghater	„ „ Javan Singhji of Khera.
10. Dolpura	„ „ „
11. Dhanda	„ „ Amar Singhji of Pyra.
12. Harmatya.	„ „ Naik Ahmed Aliji.

I beg to enclose herewith copies of the applications made to me by the Jagirdars, and zamindars of these places delineating the unjustifiable magnitude of this oppression. I had in my last letter No. 44, already informed you that I have placed a sufficient number of men at these police outposts, and the Dungarpur police has no complaint against my arrangements. I have besides taken on myself all responsibility to maintain satisfactory staff at these places. I cannot then understand why these sowars of Sarada are kept there any more. I have besides fully made known to the Mahkma Khas the many and unwarranted oppressions that these sowars are daily committing and proved to them that their presence is likely to produce disastrous results for the Thikana and the people, but not even a reply has yet been vouchsafed.

If you will kindly take the trouble to refer to my last letter you will find that my fears and presentiments are fully borne out by these subsequent events. It is the patent aim of the Sarada authorities to run and lay waste my Magra zila, and use all means to estrange my Jagirdars from me, and thus drag down my Thikana to the lowest level.

Several of my villages, e.g., Amarpura, Khumanpura, Dantari, Kelai, etc., had already been annexed and now the revenue of so many more villages has been impounded. Now, I

beg you to consider that if my villages are thus without any fault or cause wrested from me how shall I be able to maintain myself and my servants. My daughter's marriage is at hand and I do not know how I shall be able to meet its heavy expenses. My Jagirdars too would be reduced to beggary and starvation by these unjust proceedings.

I have repeatedly pointed out that these sowars of Sarada are kept in my villages without cause or necessity, and against the interest of the safety and weal of my villages. When, therefore, it is unjustifiable to keep these sowars in my villages, how much unjust it is to burden the Thikana with the expenses of maintaining the evil, against the very presence of which the Thikana has so many grave and valid objections, and the way in which these expenses are being realised is apiece with the unconstitutional and cruel policy with which all Salumbar's affairs are now-a-days being treated.

Even, if as the zemindars have been told these pledges have been extorted to recover the expenses of these sowars, the Mahkma Khas ought to have written to Salumbar giving full particulars, and demanded payment of a specified sum. If the demand had been just and Salumbar had refused to comply with it, there would have been some justification for such drastic measures, but to the present day not a single letter has been received from the Mahkma Khas in this connection, nor has Salumbar been given opportunity to submit its objections against the recovery. I therefore beg you to consider if these proceedings can be justified by any principle of ethics or equity.

Out of my two principal Jagirdars, Isarwas and Khera, the Isarwas, Jagirdar has already been made refractory and disobedient. Attempts were made to turn the Jagirdar of Khera also from the path of duty and obedience, but the Jagirdar did not succumb to the persuasions of Sarada whereupon the Sarada Hakim instigated the people of Salumbar's Muafi village Sespur to get up a boundary dispute with Khera. Surveyor Ali Hafizji who was sent by the Boundary Settlement Department declared a considerable area of Khera as impounded with a view to press the Jagirdar of Khera to yield. The Jagirdar had then applied to me in Sambat 1970, and its copy was duly sent to the Resident under my letter No. 12 of 17th April 1914, and another copy is now enclosed for your perusal (enclosure A). It would afford to you an insight into the means adopted by the Sarada Hakim to alienate my Jagirdars from me. Because the Jagirdar remained steadfast, another of his village has now been encroached upon to force him to yield to Sarada's wishes. If this improper policy is not promptly checked my Jagirdars will per force yield some day.

The Girdawar threatened to put the Jagirdar of Rathre in the stock, and make him consent to serve with the sowars of Sarada, as would appear from his application (enclosure B). Besides the said Girdawar pressed Naik Ahmadaliji, who has been appointed at the thana of Rathre, to leave the thana and throw over his allegiance to Salumbar as Isarwas had done. Naik Ahmadaliji's application is enclosed in support of this statement. Since Naik Ahmadaliji did not yield the revenue of this Jagir village Harmatya also has been impounded.

These proceedings are highly offensive to all acknowledged constitutional and moral principles and I hope you will give the question due amount of consideration. It is against humanity also to snatch their livelihood away from these poor Jagirdars who have given no offence whatever.

I respectfully beg to state that I and my Jagirdars are helpless to defend ourselves against the Khalsa's servants and our condition is now truly pitiable. Shri Darbar is my Liege-lord and master and I do obey all his commands, but it is no offence to move for the preservation of my hereditary rights and possessions, and I very much regret to say that my wailings are not heeded. You are a kind and just officer and I pray you to suggest to me a way to protect myself. I am daily being subjected to greater severity, yet I am patiently bearing every thing as you had directed me to do; but my condition is daily growing more and more wretched so I pray you to very kindly take my cases in hand soon and protect me. For this act of kindness I and my poor people will ever bless you gratefully.

#### *Application of the Patels and Patwari of Jallara.*

After the usual compliments:—

We beg to say that the Girdawar of Shri Ranaji has come to our village and has ordered us to write a pledge not to pay revenue to Salumbar and pay it to Shri Ranaji henceforth.

## Serial No. 30 ] Grievances of the Rawat of Salumbar against Mewar.

Since two days he has confined us in the Sarkari Kotri and is beating us, and threatens to send us to Sarada if we do not write such pledge, and breaks our skin.

Sri Hazur is our lord and master and should protect us, we cannot say any more. We are your born subjects, you are our lord and we hope you will protect us to-day. We should receive help to-day because we are in great trouble. We are not allowed even to go and take our food. We are your born subjects.

*Application from Kyarda (Ratna Bega).*

After the usual compliments :—

The Girdawar of Sarada has made us write a pledge not to pay revenue to Salumbar without the permission of Sarada. He has obtained such a pledge from us therefore necessary steps should be taken otherwise he will give us great trouble. Yesterday he subjected us to great trouble and extorted the pledge.

*Application of the Zemindars of Darakanakar.*

After the usual compliments :—

Raghunath Singhji Girdawar of Sarada came and having arrested us gave us many trouble and forcibly made us write a pledge that we will not pay revenue to Salumbar and had our thumb impressions forcibly affixed to it. Therefore we pray that we are in great distress and should soon be protected..

*Gameti Savji's application from Sutarya.*

After the usual compliments :—

Raghunath Singhji Girdawar of Sarada came to Thunth Mahura village and the sowars and sepoys seized us and took us away there. There we were beaten and put to many troubles and made to write a pledge not to pay revenue to Salumbar. We pray that necessary steps be taken in this matter.

*Gameti of Thunth Mahura's application.*

After the usual compliments :—

The Girdawar of Sarada came to our village and stayed there and harrassed us much and forcibly had gram, oil and ghi taken out of our homes. When our women protested they were beaten. All of us had run away and hid ourselves in the Magra but Khemraj brought us back. Then we were seized and made to execute a pledge not to pay revenue to Salumbar. Necessary action should therefore be taken. The Sarada men would arrest and confine us so we must be protected or we shall run away.

*Application made by the Patels and Patwari of Pungamra to Girdawar Girdhari Singh.*

After the usual compliments :—

We beg to say that Girdawar Raghunath Singhji of Bhorai arrested and took us away to Jaitana from Pangamra and there placed us in custody and told us to write a pledge not to pay revenue to the Jagirdar. We refused to do so and were kept at Jaitana all the night. In the morning we were again called and told to write the pledge and we again refused. Then he made Dalla pull his ears and rise and sit, whereupon out of fear we wrote the pledge to his dictation. We are now in great distress and pray for protection.

*Application of Patels Khemji, Devji, Marji and Lala of Garda to Girdhari Singhji Girdawar.*

After the usual compliments :—

We beg to say that Girdawar Raghunath Singhji of Bhorai arrested and took us away to Jaitana and there placed us under arrest and forced us to execute a pledge not to pay

rents to the Jagirdar. We refused to do so and were retained at Jaitana all the night. In the morning we were summoned and asked to write the pledge which we again refused. Then Khema was made to pull his ears and sit and rise and out of fear we wrote the pledge as he bade us do. We are in trouble and should soon be helped.

*Javan Singhji, Jagirdar of Ekhera's application.*

After the usual compliments :—

Girdawar Raghunath Singhji of Sarada arrested and assaulted the people of my village Gather on the Jeth Sudi 12th, and having placed them in custody extorted from them a pledge not to pay revenue to me. This is an unjust proceeding and necessary steps may be taken. The revenue of my village is Rs 1,000. The Sarada people will oppress me, I must soon be protected.

*Application of Savya garda and Zamindars of Dolpura.*

After the usual compliments :—

Raghunath Singhji Girdawar of Sarada gave us many troubles, and forcibly made us write a pledge that we shall not pay revenue to Salumbar, and had our thumb impressions forcibly affixed to it. Therefore we beg to state that we are in great distress and should soon be protected.

*Amar Singhji of Pyra's application.*

After the usual compliments :—

On the Jeth Sudi 12th Raghunath Singhji Girdawar of Sarada arrested the people of my village Dhanda Magra of Khandela and had them beaten and placed under arrest and extorted from them a written pledge not to pay revenue to me. This is a very unjust act and necessary action must soon be taken. The income of my village is Rs 600. The Sarada people would oppress me, so arrangements must soon be made.

*Naik Ahmad Aliji, Jagirdar of Harmatya's report to the Ziladar Magra.*

After the usual compliments :—

Garda Gotma and Jameti Amra of my village have told me that Raghunath Singhji Babail, Kamdar of Sarada, having extorted a pledge from them, had their thumb impressions forcibly affixed to it and then told them that it was a pledge of not paying revenue to the Jagirdar and the Rawatji of Salumbar. Now I beg to say that a third part of my village had previously been annexed about which I had applied to Sri Hazur before and now the Girdawar has thus forcibly extorted a pledge from the Zamindars. This jagir is the only means of subsistence that I have. Now it would be difficult for me to maintain myself, therefore arrangements should be made early otherwise we shall die of starvation. Steps must soon be taken to keep the Sarada people from taking away my revenue.

*Javan Singhji's application of Baisakh Sudi 7th, Samvat 1970.—(A.)*

After the usual compliments :—

In my father's life time the employés of Sarada had sent messages stating "the jagirdar of Isarwas is happy because he has turned against Salumbar, Salumbar cannot give him any trouble—why do you follow Salumbar and not bring your cases for trial at Sarada. If you will not do so you will suffer." Recently Ali Hafizji came and impounded the produce of my Ser land of the Baoris, whereupon I remonstrated that it was hereditary land and its corn should not be impounded. He replied "why do you not let us make enquiries and do as we tell you. You had received a hint from Sarada before and if you had acted on it you could not have suffered the loss." Then I said that I was an old jagirdar of Salumbar and Sespur also is under Salumbar, so I can have enquiries made with the permission of Salumbar only. On this account, the people of Intiwala have been instigated to get up this dispute of Sespur. Now if I do not consent to this inquiry they would take away my corn (about 50 or 60 manis) of both Baoris, and if I consent

## Serial No. 30] Grievances of the Rawat of Salumbar against Mewar.

both villages belong to Salumbar and we have never had enquiries made by the Khala Hadbast before. Now I am in great distress and request that steps may soon be taken in this matter, otherwise my people would die without corn. The survey is determined to carry away our corn and has placed his sowars on the farms. I am in great distress and arrangements must be made to prevent him from carrying away my corn otherwise I will per force have to do as he tells me and you would be displeased with me. I am in a dilemma and request early help.

*Application submitted by Fil Deri Singhji, Jagirdar of Rathri to the Thanadar Rathri.—(B.)*

After the usual compliments:—

The oppressions of the sowars of Sarada in my village have now become unbearable, and the zamindars had on this account deserted the village details of which I have from time to time submitted to you. No arrangements have yet been made and now Raghunath Singhji "Girdawar Izlai gair" came here from Manpur after 1 P.M. with sowar Kaloo and Havildar Rabim Khan of Thana Rathri and summoned my zamindars Keshya, Garda Dholya, Rarya and Bhairya, etc., and under threat of putting them in iron, extorted from them false statements:—

"We have no complaint against the sowars and sepoys of Sarada, nor do they oppress or assault us." But these statements have been extorted by force and intimidation to refute the charges standing against them. When Hakims themselves do such things, where shall we poor people be heard and given justice. We are thus being ruined and arrangements must soon be made.

When I got this information I also went before the Girdawar and he threatened to put me in irons also and to reduce me to starvation. He said that if I did not yield to Sarada the revenue of my village would be impounded, and if I did not serve with the sowars, their pay would be recovered from my village. He said all this and then tried to overawe and intimidate me and recorded my statement. Villagers had certainly fled away but I do not know why they had fled, and when I ran at that time I was at Salumbar. He pressed me thus and threatened to put me in the stock and made me sign. Therefore I beg to say that instead of redress, I am subjected to this fresh trouble, so necessary steps should be taken in this case.

*Nauk Ahmad Aliji's application dated Baisak Sudi 4th, Sambat 1973.—(C.)*

After the usual compliments:—

I have been graciously ordered to serve at the Thana of Rathri and I am carrying out these orders. Recently, Girdawar Raghunath Singhji came from Bharai to Rathri and said to me "why have you come here, you should leave the Thana and go away. Why do you obey Salumbar's orders, remain at Rathri. You must do as I tell you or you will fare ill." Then I said that I lived by Salumbar's gift and had to do service in return. Then he said "Iesarwas has lived by Salumbar's bounty but he obeys us and does as we tell him, therefore we Ahalkars of Sarada help him—in the same way if you will obey us it will be well for you, otherwise I shall have report made from Sarada and your village annexed, and leave you without food." In this strain he admonished me a great deal used many vulgar words.

Therefore I beg to say that I live by your gift and am bound to serve as I am told but the employees of Sarada say such things and I pray that necessary steps may be taken.

From—RAWAT ONAR SINGH of Salumbar,

To—The HON'BLE SIE ELLIOT G. COLVIN, K.C.S.I., Agent to the Governor-General in Rajputana, Mount Abu.

I beg to state that since the last seven or eight years, the Zila Hakims of Sarada, etc., have been exercising great severity towards my people. Details of it, I have duly been submitting to the Mahkma Khas, and the Resident, and with my letter No. of , I had submitted to you also a statement describing some of these troubles. A statement showing the subsequent troubles is now enclosed for your perusal.

## Grievances of the Rawaat of Salumbar against Mewar. [Serial No 31]

I regret to say that as yet no action has been taken on my incessant representations. Now the matter has gone so far that scarcely a day passes without bringing with it some new trouble. If there is any reasonable excuse for this procedure why is Salumbar not informed of it and asked to carry out orders? Whenever any recovery, arrests, etc., are to be made in a foreign State or an Elaqa it is everywhere customary to write to the State or Elaqa for compliance. In Mewar too, it is customary to do so, and this procedure is followed towards all the Umraos of the State. I now beg you to consider if it is just and reasonable to deny even this common and usual right to Salumbar which as is well known to you possesses rights far exceeding those of any other Thikana in Mewar.

I have continually been writing to the Mahkma Khas about this, but no notice has been taken of it. I beg to draw your attention now, to the facts, *viz.*, (i) that I think I have committed no fault to merit such treatment, and if unwillingly, I have done some wrong, it should be pointed out to me; but what law can justify the oppressions to which my poor people are daily being subjected without cause. Secondly, by what constitutional policy is it justifiable to allow the Hakims or the subordinate Ahalkars to grow so bold that they may without cause molest the people, or insult and instigate the subordinate Jagirdar to turn against the Thikana or impound the revenues of villages without any cause or giving information.

The Mahkma Khas does not listen to my requests. Instead of checking this evil, it sends back my complaints for enquiry to those very officials against whom they have been made. These officials then beat and intimidate the people to extort from them false denials to all the charges, and thus falsify all my true complaints. How far it is just and righteous to do so, I submit to your judgment. Under these circumstances, how can I or my people hope to obtain just redress.

On this account I and my people are in great distress and I respectfully appeal to you to save them from being mercilessly beaten and put in the Stocks, and the many other hardships to which they are daily being subjected. Otherwise the result would be either that my people would on account of this pressure and persecution per force turn against my authority or desert the villages and this old Thikana would be utterly ruined, which would be offensive to the kind and benevolent policy of *status quo* which the Government has invariably followed towards all the ancient and noble house of India. Or if wearied of these unbearable and constant sufferings, the people, in spite of my vigilance and strict control, ever in any way retaliate their wrongs, the result would be against the peace and the Thikana would be blamed for it. Since in either case the result is likely to be harmful I beg you to kindly give the matter your early and favourable attention. Unless the district officers are emphatically warned the trouble would go on increasing.

A reference to entry No. 6 of the enclosed statement would show you that these sowars even hinder my servants in the discharge of their official duties, and for their illegal gain impede the course of justice. In many of my villages, sowars have been placed without any cause, who in addition to oppressing my people are doing such acts also. If they are allowed thus for their gain to protect the offenders from justice how would the peace and security of the Thikana and my people be effected by it.

I am fearful lest my numerous appeals and complaints be misconstrued. I therefore earnestly beg you to kindly have enquiries made by any just and unprejudiced officer to enable you to form a correct estimate of sufferings.

Under the Government's benign rule all the people of India high and low are enjoying undisturbed peace and security, but I cannot understand why my unfortunate Thikana is not taken notice of. I doubt not that in course of time my case, too, would be looked into, but since this is a matter of my people being daily molested and my Jagirdars being robbed of their bread, I pray you to kindly give it your kind attention early. I also pray you, respectfully, to kindly advise me as to what I should do to keep myself immune from these troubles. I am now in extreme distress and am ready to obey your orders and act up to your advice for I have ever looked up to you as the Thikana's kind and just friend. I hope you will kindly consider over my petition and favour me with a reply for which I shall remain ever grateful.

## Serial No. 31 ] Grievances of the Rawat of Salumbar against Mewar.

Serial No.	No and date of report.	Designation of reporting officer.	Particulars.	No. and date of letter sent to the Mahkma Khas
1	No. 133, dated Baisak Sud 10th, 1973.	Ziladar Chhappan	Two hundred bales of grass were given to the sowars of Sarada who have unnecessarily been kept at Pangamra from the Stock. The sowars have not yet paid Rs for its cost.	No. 831, dated Baisak Sud 11th, 1973.
2	No. 14, dated Asarh Sud 12th, 1973	Girdhari Singhji Girdawar.	The sowars of Sarada who are at Pargamra took away 4 seers of oil twice from Amri Teli of Jallara and Sowar Lal Singh even threatened to use criminal force. Sowars and sepoys come daily and bring sometimes leather straps and sometimes their shoes to be greased, etc.	No. 848, Jaith Bud 1st, 1973.
3	No. 6, dated Jaith Sud 14th, 1973.	Do.	Dalla Patel of Jaitana's buffaloes while grazing in the forest strayed away to the river-side near Pangamia. Sowar Khajoo Khan seized them and demanded Rs. He realised them when Jamadar Sher Mohammad promised to pay Rs 12-0 to him.	Asarh Bud 8th No. 930.
4	No. 13, dated Asarh Bud 3rd, 1973.	Do.	Some sowars who are at Pangamia first threatened and did strike Lalya and Manya, chamaris of Jallara and had a leather martingal and headstall made and shoes also and did not pay a pice. Names of these sowars are not known. Again another sowar (name not known) and Lal Singh came to Jallara threatened to beat the chamaris and took away two leather straps. They have grown very offensive.	Asarh Bud 8th No. 929.
5	No. 433, dated Asarh Bud 7th, 1973.	Ziladar Magra	Entered in the report after enquiry, <i>vide</i> Devi Singhji Jagidhar Rathri's report: Girdawar Raghunath Singhji of Sarada came to Ruthri and summoned the Zamindars and placed them under arrest and was scolding them when the Jagidhar having got news of it came there also. The Girdawar told him not to go to Salumbai's Thana and come to their Thana and serve there and if he would not do so he would be reduced to destitution, and had the signatures of the Zamindars affixed to some kind of statements. He also threatened to handcuff and dishonour the Jagidhar and said many other evil things.	Asarh Bud 8th, No. 931.
6	Asarh Bud 7th	Kotwal Gul Mohamed Khan.	Sowar Ibrahim was sent to fetch Savram Brahman, who was called in connection with some case, from Kholri Patta Salumbar. He had proper authority for it. The above named Sowar report'd that "the Brahman refused to come with me his son named Lorya went to the village of Sespur where sowars have been sent from Sarada and brought a sowar named Mubarik with him and paid him two rupees. This sowar asked me why I had come there and what was my business. In the meantime, three more sowars of Sarada came there and surrounded me and snatched the letter of authority from me, and had me pushed by their horses and after abusing me violently, intended to pinion me and send me to Sarada. They proceeded to disarm me." The sepoys bore all this patiently and asked them to show the authority (on which they acted); but they said that they had no written order. The Sarada Hakim had given them verbal orders. The sowars did not let him bring the aqami (Brahman Savram.)	...
7	No. 41, dated Asarh Sud 4th, 1973.	Girdawar Girdhari Singhji.	Entered in the report:—That sowar Mubarik and two other sowars whose names are not known have been appointed at Sespar Patta Salumbar and a Thana established there. These Sowars oppress and misguide the people.	...

## 32

No. 401—31, dated Mount Abu, the 18th July 1917.

Endorsed by the First Assistant to the Agent to the Governor-General, Rajputana.

Serial No. 29.

(Serial Nos. 80 and 31).

Forwarded to the Resident, Mewar, in continuation of this office endorsement No. 340-31. of June 15th, 1917.

(1) Eng. Petition No. 54 of June 30th, 1917, and (2) Eng. Petition of July 1. 17, from Rawat Otar Singh of Salumbar, Mewar :

The Hon'ble the Agent to the Governor-General hopes the Resident will be able to give him a report on the alleged grievances of the Rawat of Salumbar before he goes to Udaipur.

## 33

*Memorandum.*

I seldom failed to keep Your Honour as well as the Resident informed of my troubles and difficulties; and as they arose I took opportunity of writing to Your Honour and the Resident Sahib regarding them from time to time. Lately, I addressed Your Honour upon the subject of my newest trouble which arose this year, and submitted a letter dated 15th April 1917, containing a detailed account thereof. I trust, Sir, therefore, you are fully aware of my condition. I have so far not succeeded in finding any way of setting over the troubles into which I have been enmeshed. And yet on account of my misfortune, my pursuers, undaunted and unchecked find themselves absolutely free to persist in heaping upon me troubles after troubles, till my condition, financial and other, has grown from bad to worse and is being daily accentuated. I am experiencing difficulty even in performing my daughter's marriage. You can imagine, Sir, what it costs me to say this. Again, now, very recently a communication from the Mahkma Khas of Sri Raj is inflicted on me demanding that I am liable to a twelve month attendance, that is to say, the whole year. This demand is sprung upon me in direct contradiction of all ancient tradition, hitherto honoured uninterrupted and long-standing usage and without any show of observance of rules of honor or royal custom.

I pray you, Sir, to kindly so arrange that I may not be dealt with in this matter with extra hardship and that no decision be taken in the matter unless opportunity be given me of making my representation and refuting the charges and proofs, if any, brought on behalf of the state and unless a full, thorough and regular enquiry into the matter is entrusted to an independent arbitrator, officer or judge.

Still, again, notwithstanding the supervision of criminal tribes residing on the Dungarpur Mewar boundary, footmen as well as horsemen had been appointed and sent by me and were present there. Hakim of Magra, it appears from another communication from the Mahkma Khas, sent another force of footmen and horsemen; and now the cost of these latter also is charged to me, and pressing demands are being made and urgent measures taken for its recovery.

Hard-pressed in every way and finding myself in this helpless condition, I seek your protection, Sir, and respectfully but sincerely and emphatically urge that my distress is becoming almost past endurance. Throwing myself upon your mercy as well as scale of justice, I depend upon you to advise me and to find me a way out of my difficulties. If justice fails me, Sir, at your hands, there will be no hope, left for me and my Thikana. I have accorded and do accord fullest obedience to the Sri Darbar, but attempts are allowed to be made which aim at, and have the effect of, curtailing my long-enjoyed rights, bit by bit, and I only wish, Sir, to preserve my rights, my honor and my estate.

## 34

Telegram No. 217, dated the 12th August 1917.

From—The Resident at Udaipur,

To—The Secretary, Rajputana Agency, Camp.

Your endorsement 401 July 18th. Question was gone into yesterday

Serial No. 32.

evening with Darbar hope to explain matter personally to Agent, Governor-General on his arrival here.

## 35

No. 262, dated Udaipur, the 14th September 1917.

From—A. T. HOLME, Esq., Resident in Mewar,

To—D. J. GLANCEY, Esq., I.C.S., First Assistant to the Hon'ble the Agent to the Governor-General, Rajputana, Mount Abu.

With reference to your letter No. 263-P.O. 31-Mewar, dated the 14th May 1917, inquiring

Serial No. 27.

whether any new circumstances requiring the attention of the Hon'ble the Agent to the

Governor-General have arisen in connection with the Rawat of Salumbar, I have the honour to submit a note on each of the eight complaints included in the Appendix to the Rawat's letter No. 35, dated 24th April 1917, to the Hon'ble the Agent to the Governor-General. The Rawat's letter and enclosures, as also his letter No. 44, dated the 31st May 1917, to the Hon'ble Sir Elliot Colvin, and its enclosures, (received under your endorsement

Serial No. 29.

No. 340, dated the 15th June 1917) are herewith

returned. The note on complaint No. 3 in the Appendix to the Rawat's earlier letter may be treated as the brief report called for in your endorsement of 15th June, 1917.

2. The subject matter of the complaints contained in the Rawat of Salumbar's letter\*

\*Both herewith returned.

No. 54, dated the 30th June 1917, and his letter of July 1917 to the Agent to the Governor-

†Serial No. 32.

General (vide your endorsement No. 401,† dated the

18th July 1917) are also connected with complaint No. 3 in the appendix to his letter No. 35 of 24th April 1917. Salumbar's case, briefly, is that if it is necessary and desirable to keep police posts at Rathri and Pangamra, both in the Salumbar estate, (a proposition which he does not admit) the sepoys and sowars of these posts should be Salumbar men and not Darbar men, and the Darbar, if they insist on keeping their own men at the two posts should pay for them themselves, and further, if they demand payment from Salumbar this should be made in regular form by the Mahkma Khas in communication with the Rawat's head officials. The Darbar should not, as they have done, tacitly permit the Hakim of the Magra district forcibly to collect rents directly and to an arbitrary and undetermined extent from villagers of the Salumbar estate.

3. The Mewar Darbar's reply to this complaint is that Salumbar does not properly police the Dungarpur border where it marches with his own estate; that many complaints on this score having been received from the Dungarpur Darbar, the suggestion was made by Mr. Hill as Resident, in 1907, to post Darbar sowars at selected border villages in Salumbar and other estates, and this was accordingly done; that in accordance with the usual custom Salumbar is bound to make good to the Mewar Darbar the expense thus devolving on it through Salumbar's default; and that owing to Salumbar's general contumacious attitude, the Darbar have been left no option but to collect payment direct from the villages which permit criminals to pass unchecked into and back from Dungarpur.

4. The main points at issue appear to be:—

(a) is it necessary to keep Darbar sowars at certain Salumbar villages along the Dungarpur border, or can Salumbar safely be trusted to make efficient police arrangements there? and

(b) assuming that Darbar men must be so maintained, are the Darbar justified in collecting the pay of the men direct from Salumbar villages in the event of Salumbar, on demand, declining or failing to pay for them?

From my experience when I was in charge of the Dungarpur State during the minority administration there some ten or twelve years ago, I can say that unless there has since then been a considerable improvement in Salumbar management (which I think is unlikely) it would not be wise to allow that estate to undertake the policing of the Dungarpur-Salumbar border on the Mewar side without any control by the Mewar Darbar. The Darbar are undoubtedly fortified in their justification of the action taken by them in this matter by the letter which they received in March 1907 from Mr. Claude Hill, the then Resident. He sent a list of four jagir villages in Mewar along the Dungarpur border where police might be posted, and said that if the Darbar appointed the police and recovered the cost from the Jagirdars concerned, the latter would certainly try to make proper arrangements to control the bad characters in their jagirs. On the other hand, if the Jagirdars were ordered to post their own police in these places, the police of one jagir would have no jurisdiction in another jagir, and their control over the border criminals would to that extent be ineffective.

It appears to me, in regard to (b) above, that it would be more regular and in accordance with custom for the Darbar to attach a Salumbar village and use the proceeds to cover the cost of their police posts rather than to make direct collections from Salumbar tenants. Neither His Highness the Maharana nor, so far as I know, the Mahkma Khas, Mewar, desire to countenance any wilful oppression against Salumbar; but I do not feel confident that the same can be said about the Hakim of the Magra district (Jagannathji Dhinkria) and his subordinates.

And there can be little doubt that as the relations between the Darbar and the Rawat are so unfriendly, the Maharana is perhaps sometimes inclined to lend a too ready credence to exaggerated reports made by the Hakim against this Jagirdar, and to sanction measures which he would not have countenanced if he had been made fully aware of the true facts of the case by a mere trustworthy and impartial district officer.

*Note on the Appendix to the Rawat of Salumbar's letter No. 35 of 24th April 1917 to the Hon'ble the Agent to the Governor-General, Rajputana.*

I.—Salumbar states that he has been wrongfully dispossessed by the Hakim of Sarara (Magra district) of his long standing ownership and possession of the village Kelai.

The Mewar Darbar say that Kelai is not a separate village at all, nor is it entered in the patta of Salumbar. Kelai is a portion of the village Adwas, which was formerly in the jagir of Bambora. Adwas was confiscated from the Bambora jagirdar and made Khalsa, but the Kelai portion of Adwas, by the negligence of the Darbar officials, was not confiscated along with the parent village but remained in possession of certain Rajputs to whom it had been made over by the jagirdar of Bambora.

Rawat Jodh Singh, the immediate predecessor of the present Rawat of Salumbar, was transferred by adoption from Bambora to Salumbar. When he succeeded to the Salumbar estate, he brought with him the Rajputs who held the Kelai lands, took over those lands from them and treated the Kelai area as if it were part of the Salumbar estate and in lieu thereof gave to the Rajputs half the Salumbar village of Chatpura.

The Darbar state that their version of the history of Kelai is supported by—

- (a) the evidence of neighbouring villagers and of Bambora people;
- (b) documents 105 years old by which the Kelai lands were mortgaged by the Rajputs of Adwas (Bambora and afterwards Khalsa) to certain Dangis of Ajbara, a Salumbar village. These old documents have been verified by the descendants of the mortgagees;
- (c) the unanimous opinion of the *panches*—one of Ajbara (Salumbar) and the other of Adwas (Khalsa)—appointed by the Boundary Settlement Officer, Mewar, to demarcate the Ajbara-Adwas boundary. These *panches* in marking out the boundary line, placed the Kelai area well within Adwas limits.

## Serial No. 35] Grievances of the Rawat of Salumbar against Mewar.

The Boundary Settlement Officer confirmed the line drawn by the *panches*. Salumbar filed an appeal against the Boundary Settlement Officer's decision, and the appeal is under the Darbar's consideration. Salumbar has now been directed to submit all his proofs to the Darbar.

II.—Salumbar states that a village named Dantari (or Dantardi) of the Salumbar estate, had been assigned by one of his ancestors to certain Charans. On the Charans dying without male heirs and leaving two widows, the Darbar Hakim of the Magra district took possession of the deceased Charan's property on the pretext that it was being tampered with by the Salumbar officials, and afterwards the Hakim raised the claim that Dantari had been given in jagir by the Darbar and had nothing to do with Salumbar.

The Darbar's reply to this complaint is that the case of this village first came to the notice of the State officials on a complaint by the Charans' agent that on the death of one of the widows, the Salumbar officials had come to Dantardi and wrongfully taken possession of the widow's house. Inquiries were instituted, and the surviving Charan widow submitted in writing to the Boundary Settlement Officer, about 2 years ago, that the village was a direct grant made by the Darbar. This written statement of the widow was subsequently verified by her before an official of the Boundary Settlement Office who was specially deputed to Dantardi. The widow's statement is confirmed by a *parwana* issued in A. D. 1801, during the rule of Maharaṇa Bhim Singh, by which certain Charans of this village were exempted from the payment of a number of cesses. Dantardi is not, the Darbar say, entered in the patta containing a list of Salumbar villages.

Since the Hon'ble the Agent to the Governor-General's recent visit the Darbar have issued an order to Salumbar that he should put forward all his proofs to substantiate his claim.

III.—Salumbar says that the Dungarpur Darbar complained that the Dungarpur-Salumbar border was insufficiently policed and suggested that a police thana should be established at Manpur, belonging to Isarwas, a sub-jagirdar of Salumbar, and a police chowki at Bhabrana, a village on this border which happens to lie in the Bhadesar jagir. To meet the wishes of Dungarpur, Salumbar placed a thana of Salumbar police at Manpur. The Darbar Hakim of the Magra district however instigated the sub-jagirdar of Isarwas, who is on bad terms with Salumbar, to turn out the Salumbar police by force from Manpur. Not content with this, the Hakim of the Magra persuaded the Mahkma Khas, Mewar, that Manpur and Bhabrana were not suitable places for establishing police posts to guard the Dungarpur-Salumbar border, and orders were issued that a thana should be located at Rathri and a chowki at Pangamra, both villages held directly by Salumbar. In obedience to the orders of the Mahkma Khas, Salumbar sent his police to those two places; but the Hakim went still further and deputed Darbar sowars to Rathri and Pangamra who molest the villagers and "whose aggressiveness has even cost the life" of one of the Salumbar sepoys. The cost of the Darbar police at these outposts is debited against Salumbar.

The Darbar answer to this complaint is that Manpur was not considered a suitable place for a police post to check trans-frontier crime in the Dungarpur State by Mewar subjects, because it is some miles within the Mewar border, while Bhabrana is largely inhabited by sturdy Rajputs who are well able to keep down the criminal Bhils of the neighbourhood, and to whose interest it is that tracks of stolen cattle, etc., should not be traced into their village thereby saddling them with the responsibility for making good the value of the stolen property. For those reasons, Rathri and Pangamra were chosen for police posts instead of Manpur and Bhabrana and Darbar police were sent there. It is the usual practice in Mewar, when Darbar police have to be deputed to a jagir village in consequence of the inability of the Jagirdar to maintain order and keep down crime, that the cost of such police is recovered from the Jagirdar.

My own opinion is that it is desirable to establish another police post, say at Bhabrana, in addition to, and intermediate between, those at Rathri and Pangamra. The death of the Salumbar sepoys is admitted by Salumbar to have been caused accidentally by the careless handling of his gun by a Raj sower. The Darbar propose to make further inquiries through Rao Bahadur Pandit Sukhdeo Prasad, in consultation with myself, about the sites for the location of these police posts.

IV.—Salumbar says that the people of Manpur, belonging to Isarwas, a sub-jagirdar of Salumbar complained to Salumbar of the oppression of the Isarwas jagirdar. Isarwas, when called upon by Salumbar to explain his action, did not do so and behaved with insolence. Salumbar then placed some of his men in Manpur to protect the people and keep them from deserting the village. The Darbar Hakim of the Magra, however, who assists Isarwas in his insubordination towards Salumbar, has sent Rajsowars to Manpur and they and the Isarwas men are oppressing the people who in consequence are fleeing from the village.

The Darbar state that on receipt of a communication from myself forwarding a petition purporting to be from certain people of Manpur complaining of ill-treatment by the jagirdar of Isarwas, the Hakim of the Magra was directed to submit a full report. The alleged signatories of the petition, however, denied that they had submitted any such representation and said that they had no complaint to prefer against either Isarwas or the Raj sowars.

The relations between Salumbar and Isarwas are just as strained as are those of the Darbar and Salumbar, and cross-complaints, regarding the truth or falsehood of which it is practically impossible for me to form any adequate opinion without making a personal inquiry on the spot, are constantly received in my office.

V.—Salumbar complains against the present Boundary Settlement Officer, Mewar (Pandit Tribhuvan Nath, Sopori), asserting that he decides cases, in which Salumbar is concerned, *ex parte* and in the absence of the Salumbar representative and that the Boundary Settlement Officer and the Hakim of the Magra district, by intimidation, compel Salumbar tenants and sub-jagirdars to mark out the boundary line in a manner injurious to the interests of Salumbar.

The Darbar state that Salumbar was given repeated notice to send his representative to conduct the boundary cases on his behalf, but refused to do so saying that unless his appeals were decided in his favour he would have nothing more to do with the Boundary Settlement Officer.

Before Salumbar took up this attitude 19 cases had been decided by the Boundary Settlement Officer, in which Salumbar was concerned. Salumbar filed appeals in 10 of those 19 cases. Five of the 10 appeals are still pending before the Mahkma Khas. In the other 5 Salumbar's ground of appeal was a claim on his part to Jaisamand Run lands which, situated as they are below the "contour line," by the Darbar's orders of 1908 are undoubtedly Khalsa property. Those 5 appeals were consequently rejected by the Mahkma Khas.

Salumbar has himself stated personally to me last winter that as he did not get justice from the Boundary Settlement Officer, nor, on appeal, from the Mahkma Khas (which he regards as an interested party in the appeal) he did not intend to send his representative any more to appear before the Boundary Settlement Officer. I told him that I thought his attitude was very unwise.

VI.—Salumbar states that out of the amount paid annually by Government to the Mewar Darbar as salt compensation he is entitled to receive Rs 725 per annum. This amount has not been paid to him since A. D. 1901, and has now accumulated to a sum of Rs 11,600 due to him by the Darbar. Nazrana and fines imposed on the people of his estate by the Darbar should by ancient custom be retained by Salumbar and not paid to the Darbar. But his representations in the matter have not been listened to, and a sum of Rs 8,000 odd, on account of such nazarana and fines has been claimed from him by the Darbar and deducted from the total owing to him as accumulated salt compensation. A further claim of about Rs 2,300 has been made from him under the head of settlement (presumably boundary settlement is meant) expenses, which have unjustly been imposed on Salumbar. On account of these improper claims the Salumbar village Amarpura has been confiscated by the Darbar.

It is admitted by the Darbar that Salumbar receives Rs 725 per annum as salt compensation. It has been the practice to deduct outstanding State dues before paying the balance to Salumbar; thus from A. D. 1880 to 1883, the Salumbar salt compensation money was paid to the Dewasthan (State ecclesiastical department) in satisfaction of debts due from Salumbar to that department; and from A. D. 1885 to 1895 and again from 1897 to 1899, the salt compensation money was adjusted in payment of other State dues.

It is not the custom, the Darbar maintain, that nazrana and fines imposed by State Courts on the people of any jagirdar are retained by the jagirdar on the contrary those claims have been realised without any difficulty by the Darbar in the case of other jagirdars, e.g., Budnor, Bhindar and Bedla. As Salumbar, in spite of repeated reminders, failed to pay the amount due to the Darbar on this account, the payment of salt compensation money has been held in abeyance from 1900. In 1909, Salumbar was furnished with a list of 139 cases in which nazrana and fines imposed on jagir subjects were realised by the Darbar Courts between A. D. 1883 and 1905. In 1915, a full list of Darbar dues against the estate was supplied to Salumbar with a view to their being paid, but he did not comply. Hence they were debited against the salt compensation account.

The village Amarpara has not been attached on this account, but for his disregard of Darbar orders in such matters as payment of (a) Dewasthan dues, (b) debts due to Seth Jawaharmal, (c) decretal amounts, (d) boundary settlement expenses, (e) Walterkrit Sabha expenses; and failure to perform full service, to send parties to the Darbar Courts, and to surrender convicts in Court of Vakils' cases to undergo their sentences in the Udaipur Jail.

This question of salt compensation was discussed by Lieutenant-Colonel Kaye, late <sup>\*Serial No. 11, Salt Compensation etc., file,</sup> Resident in Mewar, in paragraphs 4 and 5 of his <sup>Page 38 of Aitchison's Treaties, Volume III, 1890 Edition</sup> letter No. 186,\* dated 18th July 1912, to the First Assistant. He pointed out that the compensation was not granted to Salumbar by the Government of India under their agreement of 1879 with the Mewar Darbar and expressed the view that there would seem to be no objection to the action of the Darbar provided that money is actually due by Salumbar to the Darbar Treasury and that due credit for the same is given in the State accounts. I agree with Colonel Kaye's opinion.

VII.—Salumbar states that a village named Anjni is one of his hereditary villages and was given away by one of his ancestors to a sub-jagirdar of Salumbar. In spite of this fact being abundantly proved, the Hakim of the Magra district has wrongly declared Anjni to be a hamlet of the Khalsa village Agar.

The Darbar reply regarding this complaint is that the Hakim of the Magra district reported that Anjni was not included in the patta of Salumbar, that it was a hamlet of the Khalsa village Agar, and that the jagirdar of Anjni corroborated this and complained of undue interference by Salumbar. The matter is under inquiry in the Mahkma Khas.

VIII.—Salumbar refers to a verbal representation made by him to the Hon'ble the Agent the Governor-General regarding his service at Udaipur. Probably his contention is that he should serve for three months in the year only, as is the general custom with the majority of the first class nobles, and not for twelve months in the year, as the Darbar claim that he should.

The Darbar state that under his tenure, Salumbar has to render service for twelve months in the year at the capital. He has from time to time, on the ground of indisposition or for other special reasons, applied for leave and the Maharana has been pleased to grant his applications. Salumbar now wishes to construe those acts of grace by which he obtained leave into a customary exemption from service and thereby to reduce his period of service to three months.

In this connection I would invite a reference to paragraphs 26 and 27 of letter No. 39, dated 21st August 1855, from Colonel Sir Henry Lawrence, Agent to the Governor-General in Rajputana, to the Foreign Secretary to the Government of India (printed at page 252 of the book entitled "Relations of the Mewar Chiefs towards the Maharana of Udaipur"). It will be seen that Sir Henry Lawrence, who (as is clear from a letter in which he stated

<sup>\*Five</sup> paragraph 11 of letter No. 39, dated the 21st August 1855, page 248 of the book referred to above.

and to me") had gone minutely into the details of the relations between the Maharana and his nobles in connection with the preparation of the abortive Qoulnamat of 1854-55, verbally

<sup>+Page 49 of Aitchison's Treaties, Volume III.</sup> told the then Rawat of Salumbar that he was bound to attend the Maharana during the whole year. Salumbar in reply objected that the terms of his grant did not really mean that he and

his followers were to be on perpetual duty; that if he and they had been for years present at Udaipur, they had also been years absent. To which objection Sir Henry Lawrence, without

Paragraph 27 of letter No. 39, dated the 21st August 1855, page 252 of the printed book of correspondence *re* the Mewar Darbar's relations with his Chiefs.

dwelling on the fact that such "occasional absence" was often caused by Salumbar's consummately conduct, replied that every consideration should be given to him and all other jagirdars "on terms of obedience and good conduct".

Article 1 of the Qoulnama of 1854-55, which was not signed by Salumbar, it is laid down (page 49 of Aitchison's Treaties, 1909 Edition, Volume III) that "Salumbar does not pay chauth, but performs service at the capital for 12 months".

On the other hand, the earlier Qoulnames seem to favour Salumbar's contention that his term of service is of three months only. Tod's

Aitchison's Treaties, *ibid*, page 43. Qoulnama of 5th May 1818, Article 6 "According to command, at home or abroad, service shall be performed; the Chiefs shall be formed in four divisions, each shall remain in attendance on the Darbar for three months, and then be dismissed to their homes". (In a letter of 26th April 1819, Captain Tod wrote that the Chiefs of principal rank had all houses at the capital, where it was usual for each to remain eight months in the year, besides a general assembly on important occasions or in the seasons of general festivity). Captain Cobbe's Qoulnama which was agreed to by the parties and "sanctioned, without being guaranteed" by Government in 1827, but was not signed by the

Aitchison's Treaties, *ibid*, pages 44 and 45. parties until 1839, Article 2 "Every Sardar, accompanied by half the quota he is by sanad bound to produce, shall do personal service in his turn for three months in each year; at the expiration of his tour he will be permitted by His Highness to retire to his jagir".

Among the "additional articles to Captain Cobbe's Qoulnama", which were negotiated by Aitchison's Treaties, *ibid*, page 46. Colonel Robinson in 1840, Article 2 provided "It is customary for every chief to remain with his quota of troops in attendance on the Darbar for three months in the year".

In Colonel Robinson's further Qoulnama of 1845, Article 1 lays down: "The agreements entered into in the time of Maharana Bhim Singh and Maharana Jowan Singh are to continue in force". After the general assembly of the Chiefs at the Dassera festival, "with the exception of the Umraos who may be retained by the Darbar for duty, the others shall be permitted to retire to their homes; the Darbar shall name the chiefs and the period they are to attend on His Highness, and it will be the duty of each of them to pay implicit obedience to the wishes and orders of His Highness".

Some references to this question of Salumbar's period of service are to be found in Major Page 36, File No. 287-I. Pinhey's printed "Memorandum regarding the present relations between the Maharana and his Sardars" of 1903, and Appendices B and C to that Memorandum. The present Maharana's comments on Tod's Qoulnama included the following:—"All Sardars are not rendering service for three months only. Some have to render services for twelve months . . .". "Salumbar has

Page 50, *ibid*. to perform service for twelve months at Udaipur with its quota. So the Chief himself should remain in attendance with his full quota". Major Pinhey remarked in his Memorandum

Page 13, *ibid*. "Only the head of the Kishnawats, *viz.*, Salumbar, is exempt, both from Talwar Bandhai fees and chatond on account of his specially exalted and exceptional position, and because he is supposed to serve 12 months in the year at Udaipur". And "I do not know how far His

Page 18, *ibid*. Highness is correct in saying that some Sardars are under an obligation to perform more than the 3 months stipulated in the Qoulnama. I think perhaps that, except in the case of Salumbar, who in former days was supposed to remain always at Udaipur in consideration of his being

## Serial No. 35] Grievances of the Rawat of Salumbar against Mewar.

the hereditary "Banjgaria" of the State, the Maharana must be referring to the 2nd and 3rd class Sardars and not to the Solah".

A. T. HOLME,

The 11th September 1917.

Resident in Mewar.

## 36

No 609, dated the 14th November 1917.

From—E. J. GLANCY, Esq., I.C.S., First Assistant to the Agent to the Governor-General, Rajputana,  
To—A. T. HOLME, Esq., I.C.S., Resident, Mewar.

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No. 262 of September 14th, 1917,  
Serial No. 35. and with it of your note on each of the 8 com-  
plaints of the Rawat of Salumbar against the

Mewar Darbar.

2. Regarding complaints I, II and VII, I am to request that you will be good enough to favour the Hon'ble the Agent to the Governor-General with a report after 3 months, or sooner, if there are any important developments, as to how these cases stand. The Hon'ble the Agent to the Governor-General hopes that you will be able to keep yourself informed as to the Darbar's proceedings in the matter, and that you will be able also to obtain from the Darbar a promise that final orders will not be passed in any of those three cases, until the Resident and if necessary, the Agent to the Governor-General, have had an opportunity of being informed of the circumstances and of acquiescing in the orders proposed.

3. Complaint No. III. The Agent to the Governor General is glad to hear that the Darbar proposed to make further enquiries through Pandit Sukdeo Prasad, in consultation with the Resident as to the sites for the location of the police posts.

The Agent to the Governor-General agrees with you that the co-ordinated protection of the whole frontier can probably be carried out better by the Darbar than by different jagirdars, without the Darbar or in co-ordination with the Darbar. It does not however appear necessary or desirable that any jagirdar village should be attached in order to recover the costs until a clear necessity arises. Ordinarily the presentation of bills to the jagirdars should suffice, and it should only be when this method fails, that recourse should be had to stronger measures.

4. Complaint No. IV. The Hon'ble the Agent to the Governor-General considers that the Hakim of the Magra should be called on by the Darbar to justify his action in sending Raj sowsars to Marpur.

5. Complaint No. V. No particular case of a prejudicial decision by the Boundary Settlement Officer has been brought to notice and the Agent to the Governor-General thinks therefore that the Political authorities cannot take any action on a general complaint of this nature.

6. Complaint No. VI. It appears to be for the Rawat of Salumbar to make good his allegation that nazrana and fines imposed on the people of his estate by the Darbar should be retained by the Thikana. The Agent to the Governor-General considers that the Resident might reasonably use his influence to get this question properly adjudicated.

7. Complaint No. VIII. The Hon'ble the Agent to the Governor-General fancies that it is true that in view of his being the hereditary "Banjgaria" Salumbar is expected to be liable to remain on service for the whole 12 months, if the Maharana so desires. The Agent to the Governor-General told Salumbar when he saw him in Udaipur in August last that by resisting this claim he was not likely to improve his prospects of getting his other grievances settled by the Darbar. The Rawat of Salumbar admits that the Maharana is his lord and master but argues that the lord and master cannot take service from him for more than 3 months. His position is not really logical. The Agent to the Governor-General considers that it is most unlikely that the Darbar would really keep him on continuous service for 12 months.

## 37

No. 83, dated Udaipur, the 15th March 1918.

From—A. T. HOLME, Esq., I.C.S., Resident in Mewar,

To—E. J. GLANCY, Esq., I.C.S., First Assistant to the Hon'ble the Agent to the Governor-General,  
Rajputana, Mount Abu.

I have the honour to invite a reference to letter No. 609-31-Mewar, dated the 14th  
Serial No. 35. November 1917, from your office, dealing with

the eight complaints preferred by Rawat Onar Singh of Salumbar against the Mewar Darbar.

2. No progress has been made by the Darbar as yet in settling the disputes regarding the villages Kelai, Dantardi and Anjni (complaints I, II and VII).

3. The Darbar have now removed their men from the police posts at Rathri, Pangamra, and other Salumbar villages along the Dungarpur border, and do not intend to station them there again unless complaints are received of the failure of the Rawat and his officials to keep order in that locality. This disposes of complaint No. III.

4. As regards complaint No. IV, regarding the alleged sending by the Hakim of the Magra district of Raj sowars to Manpur, it is believed that the Darbar have recently admonished the Hakim.

5. Rawat Onar Singh has so far failed to make good his contention (complaint No. VI) that nazrana and fines imposed on the people of his estate by the Darbar should be retained by the Thikana and not paid to the Darbar. It is therefore unlikely that he can expect a decision favourable to himself in this matter.

### 38

In addition to the troubles and hardships which my Thikana (estate) had been undergoing, I beg to state that the following additions (numbered 8 to the last) to the troubles have been made.

1. Roon of Jaisamand due to Salumbar is under confiscation.

2. Damages on account of custom duties have been withheld.

3. My arrangements in the villages which had been given by my ancestors to the Brahmins as a charity, is interfered with and other villages, *viz.*, Kalai, Amarpuia and Khuman pura have been confiscated.

4. A great portion of my Thikana (estate) has been included in the Udaipur State on the false allegation of boundary dispute, in consequence of which their produce goes to the Udaipur State.

5. My Judicial powers have also been interfered with which has considerably reduced my income.

6. At the instigation of the Hakim of Sarara my subordinate jagirdars have become disobedient to me and refused to do service which under the law they are required to do.

7. Besides this there are many hardships, which have been exercised on me from time to time, have been brought to your notice, but I am sorry to state that the evils have not yet been remedied and the troubles are increasing in geometrical progression.

8. Recently, the Mahkma Khas issued a letter No. 44790, dated the 4th July 1917, re-

\*No record. But in this connection, kindly see paragraphs of notes.

quiring me to render services for full twelve months and this fact was brought to the notice\* of the Honourable Sir Elliot Colvin on 9th August

1917, but to my great misfortune the matter was left undecided, and a reply to the same letter under my No. 16 of 6th January 1918 was sent to the Mahakma Khas, and was returned after a few days to my Vakil at Udaipur who was called to take it back. It is against the procedure not to entertain the objections from Thikana to the State.

9. Eight Umraos were called on the occasion of a meeting for recruits and I was one of the members. In obedience to the orders issued in this connection, I reached Udaipur on 13th September 1917. The other Umraos were allowed, on permission being asked, to go back to their estates, but sorry to say that no permission was given to me.

10. When plague spread in Salumbar I again asked permission to proceed there to make arrangements. I was then granted permission for 20 days only. I then went to Salumbar and made some arrangement. Plague has spread in other villages also, and the villagers have evacuated their houses and are residing in the jungles. These jungles are infested with Bhils (a well known criminal tribe) and it is very impossible that the arrangements for the security of their lives and properties in the jungles should continue on a satisfactory footing in my absence from my Thikana as I understand that some of the watchmen appointed by me for this purpose are dead, in consequence of which the lives and the property are in great danger, as no arrangement can be made in my absence from Salumbar. If no arrangements

## Serial No. 39] Grievances of the Rawat of Salumbar against Mewar.

could be made for the reasons stated above, complaints will arise which could tend to show my inability of making arrangements.

11. On my completing the Daserah service, I made a request for permission in the usual manner to go to Salumbar and also by letter No. 28 of 23rd January 1918 to the Mahkma Khas to which no reply was given to me. I received letter No. 29973 of 10th February 1918 in reply to my application direct to the His Highness the Maharana Sahib Bahadur instead of a *Khas Rukka* (a special letter) setting forth the service is to be rendered for full twelve months and as 2 months and 15 days have been completed on this account, no permission can be granted.

I, therefore, lay before you these facts that rendering services at Udaipur for full twelve months means that I am not to go to Salumbar at all to make arrangements of my estate. It is also worth consideration how 12 months expenses should be arranged. Such an order contributes to nothing but ruination of my estate and myself.

Under these circumstances, I beg to request that as long as my replies and objections to the orders issued from time to time in order to give me unnecessary troubles be not filed in the file of the Mahkma Khas and the questions not decided by any liberal minded and unbiased officer to be deputed by the Local Government after going through the papers thoroughly issued from the Udaipur State and replies thereto, all orders may be stayed and I may be recommended to the His Highness the Maharana Sahib Bahadur to be allowed to go to my Thikana (Estate) Salumbar.

## 39

Letter No. 11, dated the 30th April 1920.

From—RAWAT ORAB SINGH of Salumbar,

To—The Agent to the Governor-General, Rajputana.

I have the honour to lay the following few lines for favour of your kind consideration:—

That Hikawara is a village under a century old possession of Salumbar and it was granted as a jagiri to the ancestors of Bhandari Devilalji in remuneration and recognition of good services. Recently the Hakim of District Court, Sarara, instigated Lorawar Danji Charan of Udaipur and caused him to lodge a suit in his court claiming Hikawara as his jagir by means of a forged copper plate and thus the Hakim has spitefully and in contravention of the old systems hitherto prevalent in my Thikana has awarded an *ex parte* decree in the absence of sufficient grounds and evidence in favour of the complainant. I was therefore obliged to lodge an appeal against the judgment passed by the said Hakim with the Raj Sri Mahkma Khas. But before the issue of some express and decisive orders from Raj Sri Mahkma Khas regarding the said appeal the Hakim Sarara has begun effecting execution of the decree awarded by him, through Bamina Tehsildar and some sepoys who have turned out the man of Jagirdar of Hikawara and that this matter has also been reported to Raj Sri Mahkma Khas Mewar under this office No. 456 of Baisakh Badi Nawmi corresponding with the 12th April 1920. Recently a petition from Jagirdar Hikawara of Baisakh Sudi 11th, has been received saying that his man has been turned out from Hikawara and the Hakim Sarara, before the receipt of some decisive orders regarding the appeal against his judgment has got the decree enforced by him executed. Because the Bamina Tehsildar has taken away whole of the Hasil of this year and the Jagirdars men are starving without grain. I, therefore, solicit the favour of your very kindly making necessary arrangements for the non-interference with village Hikawara and the return of this year's Hasil that had forcibly been taken away without which Jagirdar's people would starve. Interference should be checked so long as the appeal is pending against the decree. A good deal of Salumbar's revenue has been curtailed by placing several pieces of lands under Khalsa and still unnecessary interference by Sarara officials is continued resulting in the utter ruin of my Thikana. All of the papers referring to my grievances are in your office and I trust justice would soon be awarded after those have been very kindly perused by Your Honour as an authority representing the paramount power. Hoping that the above lines would receive your very kind and deep consideration and to be excused for the trouble.

